Columbia University
in the City of New York

LIBRARY

MEMORIALS

AND

CORRESPONDENCE

OF

CHARLES JAMES FOX.

EDITED

BY THE RT. HON. LORD JOHN RUSSELL, M.P.

TWO VOLUMES.

VOL. I.

PHILADELPHIA:
BLANCHARD AND LEA.
1853.

50665

PHILADELPHIA:
T. K. AND P. G. COLLINS, PRINTERS.

ADVERTISEMENT.

THE late Lord Holland employed himself for many years in preparing the materials for a Life of Mr. Fox. These materials were to be woven into a narrative, and the great events which, from 1770 to 1806, were discussed in Parliament, were to have been reviewed by the pen of an enlightened and benevolent statesman. But Lord Holland's life was a busy one, the noble idleness[1] of refined society and classical reading took up a great part of his remaining time, and little was left for transcribing, commenting, and narrating. Soon, the Life descended into a collection of materials; the collection of materials, only partially arranged, was not carried beyond the year 1786.

Lord Holland himself foresaw that he should not be able to complete his work, and one day that he was employed upon it, he told me that he believed it would be left to me to finish.

After Lord Holland's death, Mr. Allen, whose literary character is well known, and justly esteemed, began the whole again, inserted many passages explanatory of the history of the time, and caused a large portion of the correspondence to be copied.

In this state I found the papers when they came into my possession by the bequest of the late Lady Holland.

Public affairs have prevented my giving that early attention to these papers which they deserved. Like Lord Holland, I should

[1] Nobile ozio.—Machiavel.

have desired to weave into one continuous narrative, illustrated by correspondence, the life of Mr. Fox. The importance of the period during which he led, with consummate ability, the Whig party, the line he took in opposing the American and French wars, preferring the interests of the people to their applause, the singular candor, boldness, simplicity, and kindness of his character, would have made it to me a labor of love to trace the career of a man—

> "By all who marked his mind revered,
> By all who knew his heart beloved."

As it is, the work I am about to produce must have a disjointed and irregular appearance. Its greatest value will be found in the letters of Mr. Fox to Lord Holland, written between 1790 and 1805. These letters are more literary than political, and show how keen was Mr. Fox's enjoyment of poetry, especially Greek and Italian.

In the First Volume, the passages written by Lord Holland are generally marked V. H. at their close, those of Mr. Allen are included between brackets [], and mine between asterisks.

Whatever may be the defects of these volumes, they will, I trust, give Englishmen a better knowledge than they now possess of one of the most striking periods of their history, and of one of their greatest men.

J. R.

Chesham Place,
Jan. 10, 1853.

CORRESPONDENCE

OF

CHARLES JAMES FOX.

BOOK THE FIRST.

The object of this work is not to give a complete life of Mr. Fox, as that would comprise a history of the country during his time, but to arrange his correspondence, and to subjoin notes or premise short sentences to explain the events alluded to in the letters, and illustrate the character of the writer, as well as his relation with those to whom he writes, or of whom he speaks in the course of his correspondence.

In furnishing some future biographer with the materials for a more comprehensive work, the compiler proposes to divide them into six distinct periods. First, such documents, private or public, as relate to the birth, family, connections, and education of Mr. Fox. Secondly, those that refer to his own private or public life, from the period of his taking his seat in the House of Commons to his separation from Lord North in 1774. Thirdly, the correspondence, anecdotes, and events from 1774 to 1782.[1] Fourthly, from 1782 to the dissolution of Parliament in 1784.

[1] I have divided the third period, which Lord Holland had made to extend from 1774 to 1784, into two, on account of the importance of the events of 1782—the formation of the Rockingham Ministry, and the close of the American War.—J. R.

Fifthly, the letters, papers, anecdotes, and recollections relating to his private and public life, to the commencement of the war of 1793. Sixthly, letters, papers, and recollections, relating to his opinions, occupations, manners, and political conduct, from the year 1793, and during his secession from Parliament till his return to Parliament and coalition with Lord Grenville in 1803 and 1804. Seventhly, and lastly, correspondence, recollections, notes, and papers, relating to his parliamentary and official conduct, and to his public and private character, from the year 1803 to his last illness and death in 1806. These would form seven books.

Sir Stephen Fox, mentioned for his honesty by Clarendon, and for his riches by Grammont, was the founder of our family, and seems, notwithstanding some little venial endeavors of his posterity to conceal it, to have been of a very humble stock. He was born in 1627. He owed his introduction at court to Lord Percy; his favor with Charles II. to Lord Clarendon; and his general success in the world to integrity, diligence, and abilities in business. He was a Tory both in his political and religious principles; a money-getting man in his habits, and, as far as I have been able to gather from his panegyrists, his conduct and his will charitable, and affectionate in his disposition. He was remarkable for having married a second time at the very advanced age of 77 years; and as his daughters by his first marriage had the good fortune of marrying into noble families, his sons by the second had the yet greater distinction of being ennobled by promotion with the titles of Ilchester and Holland. The manner of announcing his second marriage was no less singular than the period at which it was contracted. His second wife was a Miss Hope, daughter of a clergyman of that name, and said to be goddaughter of Sir Stephen. On the death of her father she lived with Sir Stephen's unmarried daughter; and, if a paper of Governor Pownall's, communicated to me by his son-in-law, Mr. Fawkener, be correct, she announced her marriage, which had been celebrated in private, by claiming a letter directed pur-

posely to her by Sir Stephen, under the name of "Lady Fox."[1] Some letters from her to her children at school, illustrative of the manners of the last century, are in my possession. His son, the first Lord Holland and father of Mr. Fox, used to relate, with some pleasantry, a usage in Sir Stephen's family, which proves the superstitious veneration in which Tories, as well as Jacobites, held the memory of Charles I. During the whole of the 30th of January, the wainscot of the house used to be hung with black, and no meal of any sort allowed till after midnight. This attempt of rendering the day melancholy by fasting had a direct contrary effect on the children (afterwards Lord Ilchester, Lord Holland, and Mrs. Digby); for the housekeeper, apprehensive that they might suffer from so long an abstinence from food, used to give the little folks clandestinely as many comfits and sweetmeats as they could eat, and Sir Stephen's intended fast was looked to by the younger part of the family as a holiday and diversion. Sir Stephen died in 1715, and his widow two or three years after him.

The education, fortunes, political connections, and history of Henry, first Lord Holland, were favorable to the cultivation of his natural talents, but unfavorable to any great elevation of public principle. Expensive and embarrassed in his youth, he was protected and brought forward by Sir Robert Walpole, and became afterwards the public opponent of Lord Chatham; and though on many occasions the friend and supporter of the Whigs, he was at all times disgusted with the duplicity and littleness of their leader Newcastle. The correspondence at his marriage affords strong evidence of the change in manners for the better. The letters of the Duke and Duchess of Richmond, as well as the sensation of the Court on a duke's daughter marrying a man who, though of consequence in the House of Commons and in

[1] [There is a slight inaccuracy in this anecdote, as in most stories handed down by tradition. Sir Stephen had no unmarried daughter alive at the time of his second marriage. The person with whom Miss Hope had lived as companion was Mrs. Fox, wife of his son Charles.—J. A.]

the Ministry, was not of an illustrious family, prove the prevalence of an absurd pride in that day, which no Englishman can now easily conceive.

Any detailed account of Mr. Henry Fox's life and fortunes would lead the writer too far from his main subject. Nothing more than those circumstances in his situation and character, that could have an influence on the early conduct and opinions of his son, will be necessary in this work. We shall, in the course of it, have abundant evidence of the effects which his indulgent education, and the principles and connections he had espoused, produced on Mr. Fox in the first years of his life. Good and bad resulted. The good was permanent. The evil, owing to the accidents of his political life, and, above all, to the natural tendency of his disposition, was temporary, and was weeded out gradually by the society of men of purer principles and more enlarged philosophy, and by the necessary operations of a reflecting mind and an excellent heart.

[Charles James Fox was third son of Henry Fox, afterwards Lord Holland, and of Lady Georgiana Caroline Fox, eldest daughter of Charles, second Duke of Richmond. He was born in Conduit Street on the 24th January, 1749 (N.S.)]

[As a child he was remarkable for the quickness of his parts, his engaging disposition and early intelligence.] "There's a clever little boy for you," exclaims his father to Lady Caroline, in repeating a remark made *à propos* by his son Charles, when hardly more than two years and a half old. "I dined at home to-day," he says in another letter to her,[1] "*tête-à-tête* with Charles, intending to do business, but he has found me pleasanter employment, and was very sorry to go away so soon;" and writing next day, he says, "I never saw Charles so well as he is now. I grow immoderately fond of him." "Is he my sensible child still?" [he asks in a letter of the 17th December, 1754, when his son was not six years old; and on the 11th January, 1756, he writes to Lady Caroline,]—"I got to Holland House at seven, found all

[1] March 27, 1752.

the boys very well; but, to say the truth, took most notice of Charles. I never saw him better or more merry." "I found Charles" [he says in another letter written about the same time] "very well, very pert, and very argumentative."—"He is all life, spirits, motion, and good-humor."—"Stage-mad, but it makes him read a good deal." [He was naturally of a passionate temper, but learned to control it, as he afterwards told the story himself, in consequence of a conversation he accidentally overheard when a very little boy.] His mother having said to his father, "Charles is dreadfully passionate, what shall we do with him?" his father replied, "Oh! never mind, he is a very sensible little fellow, and will learn to cure himself." "I will not deny," said Mr. Fox, "that I was a very sensible little boy, a very clever little boy, and what I heard made an impression on me, and was of use to me afterwards."

Though there are many proofs in the manuscript correspondence I possess of the strong parental affection of Mr. and Lady Caroline Fox for their children, and of the expectations which the surprising and growing talents of Mr. Fox excited even in childhood, yet there is nothing in these letters which proves the excessive indulgence so often and so justly imputed to Lord Holland as the cause of the subsequent extravagance and dissipation of his son. Of the fact, however, there is no doubt. Contemporary friends and foes, intimate acquaintances and mere gossips, all concur in describing or relating traits of it. Among them an incident of a wall at Holland House is related in Mrs. Bellamy's Memoirs;[1] and I find the following confirmation of it in Manuscript Reminiscences of Sir G. Colebrook, who was no friend either of Lord Holland or of Mr. Fox. "Mr. Fox's children were to receive no contradiction. Having promised Charles that he should be present when a garden-wall was to be flung down, and having forgotten it, the wall was built up again, that he might perform his promise." This was perhaps foolish, but the performance of a promise was the moral inculcated by

[1] Letter 52d.

the folly, and that, *ce me semble*, is no bad lesson. [That he was scrupulous in keeping the promises he had made to his children appears from a letter written from Holland House to Lady Holland in the country,[1] in which he says :] "Whenever you come, do but let me know the day and hour when you will be at Salthill, and Farnen and Charles shall meet you there. I promised Charles he should see his brother, and he won't be put off."

[The first rudiments of his education were received at a preparatory school of some celebrity, kept at Wandsworth by a Frenchman of the name of Pampellonne.] "Charles," says his father, in a letter of the 24th of February, 1756, "determines to go to Wandsworth,"—[probably from a knowledge of the companions he was there to meet with. He was indulged in his choice, having had the alternative of staying at home till he was of age to go to Eton ; and appears to have remained at Pampellonne's till autumn, 1758. Of this school and its inmates there is a lively account given by the late Earl of Egremont, in a letter to Lord Holland of the 26th of January, 1820.]

EARL OF EGREMONT TO LORD HOLLAND.

"Dear Lord Holland :—

"I went to Pampellonne's school at Wandsworth at six years old, and at eight I left it, and went to Westminster. I was so young, and I am now so old, that I cannot recollect with perfect accuracy at this distance; but I am convinced that Fitzpatrick was never at that school. Charles Fox was there in my time, for, I believe, a year; which, as he was two years older than me, would send him to Eton at nine years old. There were more boys of some station in life at that little school than usual in so small a number,—I think Lord Ilchester, but I am sure his brother,[2] about my age, whose face I have never seen since. The late Duke of Leinster, and his elder brother, who died soon after, Lord Fortescue, and, I think, Lord Braybrook, Sir Thomas Frankland, the late Marquis of Townshend—but he was younger than

[1] January 18, 1757. [2] Col. Strangways, alive now, 1829.—V. H.

me, and I do not recollect him, but he was fond of such reminiscences, and never met me in company without alluding to it—and many others; but all of them except one (Lord Aylesford, who went with me to Westminster), went to Eton, and I saw no more of them until I met them at Oxford or in the world. I do not recollect whether the Grenvilles were there, and the probable reason of my doubt about it is that from near relationship I saw so much of them in early youth, that I do not distinguish between home and school. Charles Fox had left Oxford before I went there. I did not fall in with him again after Pampellonne's, until I was of age, and met him in the London world. Fitzpatrick,[1] who, I believe, was never at Pampellonne's, was at Westminster, older than me, and above me at school, but I caught him in the sixth form, saw enough of him to know that he had been very idle, and had contrived to acquire as little learning as was possible for a person of his abilities to do in his progress through the school. He was a page; and as in those days courts were very frequent, a great part of his time was lost in sedan-chairs and drawing-rooms, and in the necessary preparation of powder and pomatum. Dimiter, an old friend of mine, who had the living of Petworth, used to help him through his exercises; and what with jokes of his own, and the negligence of the masters, he got on with little trouble and less profit. I remember one instance, which diverted him and us very much. We had portions of the classics to make remarks upon. He took something in Virgil, where there was

> "Dardana qui Paridis direxti tela manusque
> Corpus in Æacidæ;"

---

[1] I transcribe this part of the letter as well as the beginning, though it has no immediate relation to Mr. Fox or his education. I do so for two reasons: first, because it regards my maternal uncle, and Mr. Fox's dearest friend, and secondly, because the observant, sprightly, and accurate writer of it, in giving me his recollections of school, has, as usual, drawn a lively picture of the times and of his contemporaries, even in boyhood.—V. H.

(a very bad line—this is my remark at 68.) Then his observation was: 'It is very odd that Virgil should have been so ignorant as not to know that Achilles was not vulnerable in the body, but in the heel.' 'Poh! it is a foolish quibble,' says the master; 'it means the person of Achilles, and not a distinction between body and heel.' Fitzpatrick acquiesced; but in three weeks' time produced it again. The master very angry—he, in his cool, slow way defending it, and all the boys laughing. In this way he went on; and I have no doubt that whatever knowledge he possessed was acquired after being at school."

[In autumn, 1758, Mr. Fox was sent to Eton. While a child, and when first at Eton, he appears to have been of a sickly constitution. In the letters preserved by his family, apprehensions are frequently expressed for his health. In one written while he was at Eton, his father says to Lady Caroline—] "Whenever you think London or Holland House better for Charles than Eton, be assured I shall like it. There is no comparison to be made between health and learning; besides that, I am sure enough for him of the latter; I wish to God I were so of the former."[1]

[While at Eton, he appears to have been a diligent scholar, and, during part at least of the time he passed there, he was assisted in his lessons and exercises by the Rev. Mr. Francis, the translator of Horace, and father of the late Sir Philip Francis. He was not, however, kept to his studies without interruption. He appears to have been frequently brought to town for his amusement, and, among other occasions, to be present at the coronation in 1761. Having about that time met with some accident, his father remarks:] "The article (in the newspapers) of Charles's mishap has brought several messages. The boy is a great deal better beloved than his father is." [In the following year, before Mr. Fox had connected himself with Lord Bute,] the Duke of Devonshire concludes a letter of business to him

[1] September 30, 1758.

with these words: "Commend me to your son Charles for his sagacity"—a strong expression from a grave man, in a grave letter, about a lad not fourteen years of age.

[In May, 1763, the fondness and mistaken indulgence of his father took him from school, and carried him first to Paris, and then to Spa. After wasting four months idly abroad, he went back to England under the care of Sir George, (afterwards) Lord Macartney, and, much to his credit, he returned to Eton at his own desire. His reception there was, however, far from flattering. He was quizzed by the boys, rallied by Dr. Barnard, the head-master, and actually flogged while fresh from the brilliant society he had just quitted. At Spa he had been initiated in play; and his father is said to have instigated and encouraged him in a propensity which became the source of much future unhappiness to both.

In November, 1763, his father went down to Eton to hear him speak, and afterwards brought him to town to attend the debates in Parliament on the publications of Mr. Wilkes. He was thus present at the passing of the memorable resolution of the House of Commons, that "'The North Briton,' No. 45, was a false, scandalous, and seditious libel;" and, from his father's connection with the ministry, he most probably participated warmly in the sentiments of the majority on that occasion.]

Among my grandfather's papers I found the following verses, written by Charles James Fox in 1764, when he was fifteen or sixteen years old, and still, I think, at Eton. When I mentioned them to him, he said: "Oh, I remember them well; it was very foolish of my father to keep them, for they are all wrong. I did not at that time know the rules of French versification." Possibly the subject, viz. a contrast between Bute and Pitt, to the advantage of the former, was as unpleasant a recollection to him as the faults in the metre of this juvenile exercise in a foreign language. That circumstance, however, gives them some little interest, and, with all their faults, they are the composition of a lad of promising abilities:—

Longtems du peuple Pitt favori adoré
Les méprisant toujours, en fut toujours aimé,
Estimant leur amour, il prodigua leur vie,
Et cherchoit la gloire aux dépens de sa patrie.
Le peuple malheureux, ébloui du succès,
Voyoit bien ses victoires, sans voir leur effets;
Dédaignant de la paix la douceur plus tranquille,
Il suivit, volontiers, une guerre inutile;
Loua de ses projets le détestable auteur,
Content d'être perdu pourvû qu'il fût vainqueur;
Et chantant de leur Pitt la vertu si vantée,
De la Chine au Perou étend sa renommée.
Tandis que de son Prince véritable ami
Bute vivoit toujours vertueux et haï,
En vain il terminoit, par une paix heureuse,
Une guerre, à la foix funeste et glorieuse;
Nous lui refusâmes l'amour qui lui fut dû,
Il perdit cet amour en suivant la vertu.
Nous sommes des ingrats, qui rendant nos hommages
A un fourbe orateur, refusons nos suffrages
Au digne Citoyen, qui nous aime à ce point,
Qu'il nous veut conserver quand nous n'en voudrons point.
Recevez ce portrait, cher Nicole, d'une terre,
Que je rougis, en effet, de nommer ma mère.

1764. C. J. F.

[In spring, 1764, Lord Holland writes from Paris to Mr. Campbell, of Cawdor:] "My son Charles really deserves all that can be said of his parts, as I will convince you when I see you at Holland House. But he has what I value much more—good sense, good nature, and as many good and amiable qualities as ever met in any one's composition. I have two sons here; the eldest bids fair for being as universally and as much beloved as ever I was hated. Thus happy in private life, am I not in the right to leave the public?"

[Having remained at Eton until the commencement of the summer holidays in 1764, Mr. Fox was sent in the following October to Oxford, and placed at Hertford College, under the tuition of Dr. Newcome, afterwards Primate of Ireland. Hert-

ford College was always a small and poor college, but had at that time obtained a temporary celebrity from the reputation of Dr. Newcome,[1] in consequence of which Mr. Fox, and other young men of rank, were sent to it. Some years after it became extinct; the building, having escheated to the Crown, was transferred by act of Parliament to the University, and now forms the site of Magdalen Hall.] Of Mr. Fox's application at college, and of his habits, extracts from his own letters, and those of his relations and friends, will afford the best proof.

C. J. FOX TO SIR GEORGE, AFTERWARDS LORD, MACARTNEY.

"Holland House, *December* 25, 1764.

"Dear Macartney:—

"As my father defers writing because I write, you will expect to hear all the news of the town from me, and I will satisfy you as much as is in my power. Sir Thomas Clarke, Master of the Rolls, died about a month ago, upon which it was first settled that Norton should have his place, and Charles Yorke to be made Attorney-General; but he altered his mind, and would not take it. However, he had a patent of precedency, and Sewell is made Master of the Rolls.

"It is said that Charles Yorke refused the Attorney-Generalship, because Lord Sandwich would not comply with some of his demands relative to Cambridge. He insisted that Lord Sandwich should give him his word never to oppose any Cambridgeman whom Lord Hardwick and Yorke should recommend. If this be his reason, why did he accept the patent of precedency? Churchill is dead. His friend Wilkes has published a pamphlet called a letter to his constituents at Aylesbury, and sent it to London by Mr. Stanley's servant to Lords Mansfield, Halifax,

[1] [Dr. Newcome was appointed to an Irish bishopric in 1767, and after various translations he was promoted, during Lord Fitzwilliam's short Lieutenancy, to the Primacy. It was said at Dublin, when Lord Fitzwilliam was abruptly recalled, that Dr. Newcome's appointment was the only lasting benefit he had been able to confer on Ireland.—J. A.]

Sandwich, Temple, and others. It contains nothing but a justification of his conduct as to the 'North Briton.' He says it was respectful to the King. The 'Essay on Woman' he calls an idle poem, in which he had ridiculed nothing but a creed which the great Tillotson wished the Church of England fairly rid of. It contains violent abuse of Lord Mansfield. . . . .

"This is all the public news I can think of. If I recollect more before I finish I shall put it in, though perhaps you may have heard all before from some other correspondent. Now for private news. The Duke and Duchess of Grafton are parted. I cannot learn the immediate reason of their separation. All I have heard is, that their tempers did not suit. Our friend Hinchcliffe[1] is tutor to the Duke of Devonshire, by which he has 600*l.* a year. I have not seen him since. Crewe is in town. James I saw two days ago, who intends writing to you soon. Crawford goes with me to-morrow to Bunbury's, where Upton,[2] I believe, will come too.

"Lord and Lady Holland and Harry go to-morrow to Goodwood. We have heard lately from my brother (Stephen); he is very well, and loves Paris better than ever. Mrs. and Miss Greville[3] went out of town the 18th. Miss Greville had been ill, but was recovered. I forgot to tell you that we do not hear my brother plays, which, I believe, you will be glad to hear. My mother is very well. My father complained of pain in his knees, but he is now better, and, in my opinion, very well; he has had the asthma once or twice, but not bad.

"We have heard from Lady Susan since her arrival at New York. I do not think they will make much of their lands, and I fear it will be impossible to get O'Brien a place. I like Oxford well enough. I read there a great deal, and am very fond of mathematics. I believe I shall go to Paris in the spring with my mother; Lady Sarah,[4] perhaps, may go with us. She will probably return with us. I fear you had a very un-

[1] Afterwards Bishop of Peterborough.

[2] Afterwards Lord Templeton.

[3] Afterwards Mrs. Crewe.

[4] Lady Sarah Lennox.

pleasant journey. I hope the cold of Petersburg agrees with you. We have very cold weather here. I hope to hear from you very soon. I can recollect nothing more at present you can wish to hear, except that I am very well. Believe me, my dear Macartney, I sincerely wish you so, and that you may always be happy. Any professions of friendship would be needless from one whom you know to be so affectionate a friend. I wish sincerely for our meeting. If you stay long in Russia, I may perhaps visit you there.

"Adieu,

"Yours unalterably,

"C. J. FOX."

Mr. Fox had always a great regard for Lord Macartney, and thought him, as he was, a very friendly and honorable man. But Mr. Fox did not retain the high notion he had conceived of his abilities early in life, and used afterwards to smile at himself for having mistaken Macartney's singular memory and absurd paradoxes for great acquirements and abilities. Macartney was in truth a foolish, good sort of man, with a prodigious memory, and a playful sort of self-sufficiency, which induced him to sport paradoxes he could not maintain, and to imagine that those whom he invited to laugh at them secretly admired him for his courage or ingenuity in avowing them. He was much too affected and artificial to suit Mr. Fox as a companion, and much too worldly to espouse his politics or attach himself to him in public.

Horace Walpole says of Macartney in 1768, "He was a young and handsome Irishman attached to Lord Holland, with whose eldest son he had travelled as a kind of governor. He was an amiable man, with various knowledge and singular memory, but no other extraordinary talents."[1] The character is a just one.

[1] H. Walpole's Memoirs.

MR. FOX TO SIR GEORGE MACARTNEY.

"OXFORD, *February* 13, 1765.

"DEAR MACARTNEY:—

"I received, about a month ago, a letter from you, dated Memel, in Russia, which gave me great pleasure, as it gives me hopes that I shall hear from you pretty constantly. You cannot expect to hear much from this place. All I know that you can wish to hear is that Sir William Meredith made, the 29th of last month, a motion to declare (general) warrants illegal, and that it was determined not to put the question by a majority of 224 to 185. I really know no more of politics, but will send this open to my father, who will perhaps tell you more. I refer you to him for news from Ste, as I have not heard from him. I am heartily obliged to you for your advice about French, which I will undoubtedly follow, as I am thoroughly convinced of its utility.[1] I read here much, and like vastly (what I know you think useless) mathematics. I believe they are useful, and I am sure they are entertaining,[2] which is alone enough to re-

[1] He kept his promise; and, in the course of that and the two ensuing years, made himself an excellent Frenchman. Few Englishmen have ever spoken or written that language with more care and correctness. Napoleon is made, in some memoirs, to quote Mr. Fox as saying something—"*dans son mauvais Francais.*" I think it is unlikely; but, if true, it will perhaps confirm the suspicion that he was himself neither a judge nor a proficient in the pronunciation and idiom of the language. Parisians pretend that he spoke it with a strong Italian accent; and Mr. Fox himself remarked that it was not the French of old Paris society.—V. H.

[2] Rather a whimsical epithet for mathematics. Perhaps he had a fancy to combat one paradox with another. Macartney thought mathematics useless; so he declared them entertaining. When he says he read much mathematics, regard must be had to the place from whence he wrote. What constituted—and, above all, what then constituted—much mathematics at Oxford, would be very little at Cambridge, or in any other place destined for the education of gentlemen. But a lad of sixteen may be allowed to speak the language of the place. Mr. Fox had a wonderful capacity for calculation, and a great aptitude, no doubt, for all branches

commend them to me. I did not expect my life here could be so pleasant as I find it; but I really think, to a man who reads a great deal, there cannot be a more agreeable place. My mother still continues in her resolution to go to Paris in spring, where I shall be with her. My brother will probably return with us. I think I have now told you all I know about our family and their intentions, in return to which I hope to hear a great deal about Petersburg and your reception there. I cannot suspect you again of being so devoid of taste[1] as to fall in love with a woman under forty, though as you have once begun to give way, you may perhaps be reduced in time to be in love with a tripping milliner girl of fifteen. I hear there is very deep play at Petersburg. I hope that that will not tempt you to break your resolution against gaming. I think you did very well to pass your Latin speech upon the magistrates of Dantzic for extempore. I cannot say your application of Ste's speech about Sir James Macdonald was well applied. When he complimented the English young men, he included himself and raised their idea of him. You, on the contrary, lessened their opinion of you by putting the other ministers on a par with yourself. Crawford and James, when I saw them last, both intended to write to you. Whether they have or not, I cannot tell. If there were any way of sending you pamphlets, I would send you a new poem, called the 'Traveller,' which appears to me to have a great deal of merit. I do not know anything else that I would advise you to read if you were here, though there have been two or three political pamphlets much admired. I was told the rest of your journey was likely to be tolerable enough on account of the frosts. I hope it proved so. You did

of mathematics; but I have often heard him regret that he had applied so little to them; and ascribe his neglect of them to the superficial manner in which they were taught at Oxford. A symptom of the little store set upon them may be discerned in the subsequent letter of Newcome to his pupil.—V. H.

[1] One of Lord Macartney's paradoxes, that a woman was never lovely till she had passed forty.

not describe your stay at Memel as agreeable. It is indeed a great way from hence to Russia, but I do not absolutely despair of seeing you there, though the thoughts of it at present I believe frighten my mother a little. However, if I never see you there, it may not perhaps be so long before we meet as we at present imagine. Let us, however, supply as much as we can what the distance that separates us forbids by writing continually to each other. So as I hear often from you (if it be but to tell me you are well), I shall be satisfied, and will promise in return to write regularly. I dare say you will now and then have a letter from Ste. You know him too well to expect to keep up a regular correspondence with him. I am, dear Macartney, with the most unalterable friendship,

"Yours,

"CHARLES JAMES FOX."

Here follows a postscript from Lord Holland, confirming the newspaper intelligence, and not worth transcribing, or even adverting to, further than as it proves the easy footing on which Charles Fox lived with his father.

Another letter from Mr. Fox to Sir George Macartney gives an account of the exaggerated report of his father's illness, which had been sufficient to call him from Oxford, but never dangerous, and, when he wrote, nearly removed.

In March, 1765, Lord Holland, in a letter to Sir George Macartney, says—"At Easter, the three sisters[1] go to Paris, Charles and I sail to sup with them at Calais. Charles goes on with them, and I return to Kingsgate—Charles is still at Oxford, and, I hear, studying very hard."

It was probably upon his apprising his Oxford tutor, Dr. Newcome, of this expedition with his mother to Paris, that that

[1] [The three sisters were Lady Holland, Lady Louisa Conolly, and Lady Sarah Bunbury, in addition to whom the party consisted of Stephen Fox, Charles Fox, and Mr. Upton. They sailed on the 22d April, went no further than Paris, and returned to England on the 8th of July. Charles Fox went back to Oxford, and remained there till spring, 1766.]

gentleman wrote him the letter of which the following is a copy, and which Mr. Fox carried about in his pocketbook during the latter years of his life, and used not unfrequently to produce with a sort of playful triumph to confute his political friends, when they censured him, with great appearance of reason, for his idleness and negligence in not reading parliamentary papers and other necessary documents.

EXTRACT OF A LETTER FROM DR. NEWCOME TO CHARLES JAMES FOX.

"You judged rightly in thinking I should be much surprised by the information you were so obliging to give me. But upon reflection I think that you have done well to change the scene in such a manner, and I feel myself inclined to envy you the power of doing it. Application like yours requires some intermission, and you are the only person with whom I have ever had connection, to whom I could say this. I expect that you will return with much keenness for Greek and for lines and angles. As to trigonometry, it is a matter of entire indifference to the other geometricians of the college (who will probably continue some time here), whether they proceed to the other branches of mathematics immediately, or wait a term or two longer. You need not, therefore, interrupt your amusements by severe studies, for it is wholly unnecessary to take a step onwards without you, and therefore we shall stop until we have the pleasure of your company. All your acquaintance here which I know, are well, but not much happier for your absence."

[On his return from Paris, Mr. Fox went by his own choice for another year to Oxford.] "Charles has been here," says his father in a letter to Sir George Macartney, dated Kingsgate, July 25, 1765, "but is now at Oxford studying very hard, after two months at Paris, which he relished as much as ever. Such a mixture in education was never seen, but extraordinary as it is, it seems likely to do very well."—"Charles is at Oxford, applying himself" [says his mother in a letter of the 14th November,

1765]; "next spring he purposes to leave it entirely. What his future schemes are I don't know." He passed the greater part of one whole vacation at Oxford with his friend and contemporary Dickson, afterwards Bishop of Down, a man remarkable for warmth of heart and gentleness of disposition, as well as for uncommon agreeableness of manners and singular advantages of person. They studied very hard, and their relaxation consisted in reading to one another, or by themselves, all the early dramatic poets of England; they spent their evenings for that purpose in the bookseller's shop, and I think I have heard Mr. Fox say, that there was no play extant, written and published before the Restoration, that he had not read attentively. From some accident or another he and Dickson were at this time without money, and as they had no acquaintance between Oxford and London, likely to give them credit, they determined without a penny in their pockets to walk up to Holland House (full 56 miles) without any expense of conveyance, lodging, or board. The day was sultry, and when they had got to Nettlebed, between Benson and Henley, Mr. Fox was so hot and fatigued that he stopped with his friend at an alehouse, to eat some bread and cheese and drink some ale. He was obliged to leave his gold watch in pawn, for the payment of his homely fare, with the landlord, and performed the rest of his journey in the course of the day. On his arrival, his first exclamation to his father, who was taking his coffee, was, "You must send half a guinea or a guinea, without loss of time, to the alehouse-keeper at Nettlebed, to redeem the gold watch you gave me some years ago, and which I have left in pawn there for a pot of porter." He always plumed himself on the steadiness and length of his walks, and even later in life, and when he was grown corpulent, not unfrequently decided any disputed distance by walking five or ten miles himself, in full confidence that the time he employed in it was a sure measure of the distance.

There is reason to suppose that some months and even years before Mr. Fox was elected to a seat in Parliament, his success there was foretold by his friends, and confidently expected by his relations. The verses of Lord Carlisle on his companions at

Eton designate Charles Fox to act the most conspicuous part in the Senate; and in the foregoing pages, as well as a variety of other letters of my family, his powers as an orator were distinctly predicted. Between school and his actual appearance on the great theatre of the world, other and less agreeable prognostics were afforded of his future career. His mother does not seem to have been insensible to the dangers to which the ardor of his mind and the unbounded indulgence of his father might expose him. Among other things his rivalry with young William Pitt, his junior by ten years, seems to have been early predicted. The Duchess of Leinster related to me a conversation, at which she was present, between her sister, Lady Caroline, and Mr. Fox (Lord Holland). Lady Caroline, in expostulating with her husband on his excessive indulgence to his children, and to Charles in particular, added, "I have been this morning with Lady Hester Pitt, and there is little William Pitt *not eight years old*, and really the cleverest child I ever saw, and *brought up so strictly and so proper in his behavior*, that, *mark my words*, that little boy will be a thorn in Charles's side as long as he lives." [In telling this story, the Duchess of Leinster naturally called the persons she mentioned by the names she first knew them by. It is almost unnecessary, therefore, to say, that when Mr. Pitt was eight years old, his mother had been many years Lady Chatham, and Mr. and Lady Caroline Fox, Lord and Lady Holland.]

Such predictions are no doubt often made by parents, who fancy they see the future celebrity and importance of their children. Ninety-nine times out of a hundred the greatness of the individual, the groundwork of all the anticipation and apprehension, is not realized. But when such predictions turn out true, one has a childish pleasure in recording them.

[In a letter to Sir George Macartney, dated from London, 14th of March, 1766 (to which he had been summoned from Oxford on account of his father's illness), Mr. Fox mentions his having been present at the debate on the repeal of the Stamp Act in the House of Lords, and his having thought the Duke of Grafton's speech the best he had ever heard there; but the in-

teresting part of the letter is the proof it affords of his early intimacy (he was then only seventeen) with Mr. Burke. Sir George Macartney had, it seems, sent him a copy of a speech he had made to the Empress of Russia.] "I think," says he, "your speech to the Czarina one of the prettiest things of the kind I ever saw. I did not observe literally your commands about it, but I have shown it to very few people. Mr. Burke admires it vastly."

[Writing to Sir George from Holland House on the 3d of May, he says, that] "His father, in having assigned to him, in his correspondence with Macartney, the province of politics, has in a manner condemned him to silence; for, since the repeal of the Stamp Act, there has been no news of that sort. The Ministry goes on just as it did, everybody laughing at them and holding them cheap; but, according to the fashionable phrase, doing justice to their good *intentions*." [Such was the language he held at that time of a party into which he afterwards infused so much spirit and vigor.]

[In a letter from Lord Holland to the same, of the 30th of June, he expresses himself with the utmost warmth and tenderness towards his son.] "Charles is above measure kind and attentive to me. He has a good heart, and is more to be admired for that than for his head, which you know is no bad one. I am very happy in my family, and that may well atone for what I have to complain of in the article of friends."

[Mr. Fox finally left Oxford in spring, 1766, and though the following account of the two succeeding years of his life is nothing more than a dry catalogue of dates and names, it may not be a useless preface to the letters and to the remarks of Lord Holland that follow.

On the 23d of September, 1766, Lord and Lady Holland sailed from Kingsgate, in the Isle of Thanet, for Calais, and on the 6th of October their son Charles, who had gone some days before on a visit to M. de Mortfontaines at Soissons, met them at Lyons. From Lyons, Lord Holland, Charles, and Lord Ossory went down the Rhone to Marseilles, where they embarked for

Naples. Lady Holland, her two other sons, and Lady Mary Fox, wife of Stephen Fox, crossed the Alps, and joined them at Naples, where they passed the winter. In March, 1767, they set out on their return to England, and towards the latter end of May Lord and Lady Holland arrived at Holland House. Charles, who had made occasional excursions during their route through Italy, left them at Turin on the 26th of April, and went to Genoa to meet Lord Fitzwilliam, with whom and Mr. Uvedale Price he passed the summer. Towards the end of October Lord and Lady Holland set off again to the continent, and were met at Paris by their son Charles. He soon left them again, and after several short tours in the south of France, in company with Lord Carlisle, he joined them at Nice before the middle of December. At Nice they remained till April, when Lord and Lady Holland returned to England, and Charles went back to Italy. According to the plan he had proposed and probably executed, he was to go by Genoa, Lerici, Pisa, and Sienna, to Rome; it appears he was in that capital when the Queen of the two Sicilies passed through Rome on her way to Naples. On his return home in company with Mr. Uvedale Price, he visited Voltaire at Ferney, and arrived in England on the 2d of August. In the following September, he accompanied his brother Stephen, who, with his wife, Lady Mary, and Mr. Dickson, who has been before mentioned, made an excursion of three weeks through the Austrian Netherlands and Holland. He had been returned for Midhurst to the Parliament that met on the 10th May, 1768, but in consequence of his absence from England he did not take his seat during the first session.] At Florence he saw much of Lord Fitzwilliam, of Mr. Price, and of Mr. Crofts, a clergyman, who was a good Spanish scholar, and then travelling with Lord Fitzwilliam. He seems by his letter, dated from that place to his friend Richard Fitzpatrick (September 22d, Florence) to have been much occupied with projects of acting plays, and with the study of Italian literature. Acting plays became quite a passion with him during that and the ensuing year. His sister-in-law

(Lady Mary Fox, then recently married) and her brother, Richard Fitzpatrick, no doubt partook and fomented the passion. He was at Rome, when the Queen of Naples was married (in summer, 1768). He travelled with Mr. Uvedale Price, the ingenious author of "The Picturesque," and then an Eton, tennis, and acting acquaintance of his own age, by Terni and Loretto, to Venice, and he passed Mantua by night, and joined Lord Fitzwilliam at Turin.

Although Mr. Fox at this period of his life entered eagerly into the pursuit of pleasure, he seems never to have intermitted his studies entirely, especially those of the modern languages of the countries in which he was travelling. Even in his amusements his active, acute, and creative mind was always employed, and his judgment and taste were improved by observation and exercise. During the year 1767, which he passed abroad, either with travellers of his own age or with his father and mother (who spent part of their time at Naples, Nice, and Paris), he was assiduous in learning the languages of France and Italy, enthusiastic in his admiration of Italian poetry, and fond of exercising his ingenuity in French composition. His letters to Richard Fitzpatrick are generally in the latter language, and many passages of them in verse, in the structure of which he seems to have been particularly careful and critical. In subsequent letters he often refers to his former verses, and expresses great anxiety to correct any false rhyme or defective prosody which, on recollection, he suspects to have disfigured his versification. This propensity to labor at excellence, even in his amusements, distinguished him throughout life. Not only would he turn the verse, in every *jeu d'esprit* of his composition, fifty different ways, but at every little diversion or employment—chess, cards, carving at dinner—would he exercise his faculties with wonderful assiduity and attention till he had attained the degree of perfection he aimed at. It was this peculiarity which led him, many years afterwards, when asked how he contrived, being so corpulent, to pick up the cut balls at tennis so well, to answer,

playfully, "because I am a very painstaking man."[1] So also on his appointment to the Secretaryship of State in 1782, piqued at an observation on his bad writing, he actually took a writing-master and wrote copies like a schoolboy. In the same spirit, when he determined on living in the country, he devoted himself to the practical work of a gardener; and, in like manner, in order to qualify himself for carving, he used to have a small book of instructions of that art at table, and executed the problems laid down in it by imitating on the real joints the lines laid down in the engravings. During the period of his life to which these extracts and notes refer, he seems to have been very earnestly occupied with private theatricals. His letters are full of them, and some passages at least may be worth preserving as indications of the earnestness with which he engaged in any pursuit he undertook. My father had, probably in a great measure at the instigation of his brother Charles, established private theatricals in his country house at Winterslow, near Salisbury, and his wife, Lady Mary (my mother), and her brother Fitzpatrick were among the performers. Charles Fox and Richard Fitzpatrick were nearly equal in tragedy, and they used to exchange characters and act alternately the principal parts. In general, Mr. Fox was preferred in tragedy; but General Fitzpatrick was supposed yet more decidedly to have the superiority in genteel comedy. This passion for acting (for it was with him not less earnest than a passion), which seems to have begun as early as 1765, lasted till 1773. It gave him, as I have before observed, a great knowledge of plays (prodigious numbers of which he had read with great delight and singular attention), and it was often remarked that his quotations and allusions in his speeches from passages not commonly known in our dramatic authors, both serious and comic, were very frequent and very happy. Perhaps his practice of acting was not less useful to him as an ora-

[1] Cut balls are balls which pass just over the net, and do not rise high above the floor of the tennis-court. It was Lord Holland who asked Mr. Fox this question. The answer is only valuable as showing that in no art is excellence attained without labor.—J. R.

tor in the modulation of his voice. His delivery was indeed too natural and too rapid to convey to a common observer any appearance of art. Yet the power of expressing passion by the tones of his voice had no doubt been brought to perfection by his exertions on the stage. For, notwithstanding some unpleasing shrillness, unharmonious cadences, and occasional screams beyond the scope of his organ, he possessed the faculty of touching the heart by his voice without deviating into anything like theatrical display, beyond any orator I ever heard in public. His deep tones, which occurred very rarely, and very shortly, and only in solemn appeals to the feelings and justice of his audience, had the most thrilling effect, and could scarcely have been attained by any one who had not disciplined his voice at some period of his life to such a purpose by the recital of sublime or impassioned passages of poetry. It was indeed, if not a peculiar, a striking feature in Mr. Fox's oratory, that it bore along with it, as it flowed naturally from him, a great variety of manner as well as matter.

Not only the extent of his learning, and the great resources of his mind, but the experience and observation with which intercourse with every class of society and interest in every pursuit and amusement in life had furnished him, enforced and embellished his reasoning, assisted, and, above all, enlivened his illustrations.

During the whole of the first period of Mr. Fox's life, and up to the time of his being returned to Parliament, there are few traces in his correspondence of any very strong opinion in politics, and what there are show his personal affection to his father and others, engaged or engaging in those pursuits, rather than any formed judgment upon public matters. He seems to have sympathized with his father in his resentment against the Bedfords and Mr. Rigby, and, as his father's animosity to Lord Chatham abated (which it did on the dismissal of the first Rockingham administration), his son's prejudices against him seem also to have softened. In writing to his younger friends, he expresses an eagerness and an earnestness about their obtaining

peerages, ribbons, and other baubles, which, if he had been reminded of at later periods of his life, would have made him either smile or blush. He says somewhere that the green ribbon for his friend, Lord Carlisle, before he was well of age, was one of the *best things* done for *this great while;* and he confesses that an English peerage for Lord Ossory would almost reconcile him to the admission to office of the Bedford party, which, for other filial, if not public reasons, he earnestly deprecates. There are also letters relating to elections at Stockbridge and elsewhere, in which much personal interest for the candidates, but little or no anxiety about public affairs, is expressed.

[His correspondence preserved during this period illustrates these remarks.]

C. J. FOX TO MR. CRAWFORD.[1]

"Naples, 15*th January*, 1767.

"Dear Fish:—

"You said you would write to me if you could find anything I should like to hear. In your last to Ste, you say the Bedfords have been cruelly used; did not you think I should be glad to hear that? But I am sadly afraid you are imposed upon, and they have not been so ill used as I always wish them to be. *Let them feel how sharper than a serpent's tooth it is to have a thankless friend.* Notwithstanding which, you say I am thoroughly convinced Lord Chatham was sincere in his negotiation, that is to say, he meant to buy them upon reasonable terms, and that the exorbitancy of those they proposed was what hindered it taking place. All the letters we have had, mention those

[1] In Madame du Deffand's correspondence with Horace Walpole is to be found some account of Mr. Crawford's conversation and manners as a young man. He seems to have been very affected. Lord Holland used to relate that on some occasion Lord Egremont hearing at a dinner party of the death of a friend, burst into tears, and was obliged to leave the room. While every one was pitying him, Mr. Crawford said testily, "If *I* hear of the death of a friend, *I* burst into tears, and if *I* am overcome, *I* leave the room."—J. R.

terms as such; but I wish your account may be true, for it is more mortifying to be refused a guinea than 1000*l.* They are now, I understand, joined with Lord Rockingham, &c., the only party whom they have not already tried at. Lord Bute, the Duke of Grafton, and Lord Chatham, have sent them empty away; and, I hope and believe, if the others ever come in, they will serve them in the same manner. They asked, we hear, three peerages; one of them, I suppose, was for Lord Ossory, and this would go near to make one sorry they were refused, if I did not think that he would be sure of one some time or other, and that having it immediately would be no great advantage to him. I know few men more prejudiced than he is in party matters, and therefore I dare say that what he called forwardness in Burke last year, he will now call spirit. Do you know whether there was anything to be done for Bunbury, if the negotiation had taken place? But I am at too great a distance to ask questions. In all the news we have had, I have not heard Lord Temple or G. Grenville mentioned. I hope there are no negotiations on foot with them.

"As for Stockbridge, you are positively sure for yourself, but I cannot say I see any likelihood of choosing two; you must be the best judge yourself when you are there. If you should think there is any chance for two, Macartney or my brother must be the other; but we think there is so little chance of this, that we hardly think it worth writing about.

"There is nothing, my dear Crawford, that I can tell you from this place interesting to you, except that we are all well, and lead a very pleasant life here. When I say we are all well, you understand I do not mean that my father is in as perfect health as we could wish him, but really I think him considerably better than when he left England."

LORD HOLLAND TO C. J. FOX.

"*July* 24, 1767.

"Dear Charles :—

"I hope I shall not mind it, but your advice has been followed with as bad success as possible. It is my opinion, Lord B.'s[1] application did more harm than good, and, whilst he is cried out upon for doing everything at Court, he *can* do nothing. *He has not seen the King in private these two years*;[2] and I, who to my cost have already once made his Majesty an exception, do not do so any more; but I believe long absence has had its usual effect. But this is *entre nous*. I was at Court yesterday for the first, and, I believe, last time. I had as much to say as any man ever had, and *said* it. I saw obstinate, determined denial, without any reason given; nor had I any occasion to follow your advice, *to take a shuffling answer for a denial*, for I was not flattered even by a shuffling, promising answer, but told it would be very inconvenient to do it now, without being told why (and the Duke of Grafton says he does not know of one promise, nor does he think it unreasonable), or when there would come a time when it might not be inconvenient.

> "'Of all court service know the common lot,
> To-day 'tis done, to-morrow 'tis forgot.'

Don't ever, Charles, make any exception, or trust as I did. Well! I may thank myself, and have nothing to do but to forget it. I trust I shall, for, after all, what does it signify? But my spirits are sometimes low, and then I shall fancy this is the reason, whereas, if I had not this, they would be as often low, and I must find some other. July 28.—I have given Lord Carlisle a packet for you, which contains all my fugitive pieces; when

[1] Bute.

[2] This remark from a man so well informed as Lord Holland confirms what the King himself told his son the Duke of York.—See *Bedford Correspondence*, vol. iii.

you come to Geneva, as you will do one day or another, there is a pretty large packet of them, which is sealed up, and which Mr. Gaussion is to deliver only to you.

"Lord March, Lord Carlisle, and G. Selwyn set out the latter end of this week. Lord Carlisle *says* he shall stay but a fortnight at Paris, where he expects a letter from you, and then go directly to you. Jack Nicol sets out to-day for Spain. He gave me before he went your French verses, which I wonder you never told me of, as they are excessively good—*very fine*, Dr. Campbell says, and Sir George Macartney; Mr. Selwyn and Lord Carlisle admire them extremely. The latter expresses his surprise (I think not entirely without anger) that you never showed them to him. Mr. Upton is assisting his friend Lord Thanet's marriage at Grantham. She is very handsome, and the settlements he makes (where they told him they would ask none) are immensely great.[1] To morrow I go to Winterslow. Sir George Macartney will come on Sunday. By that time Upton, I fancy, will be at leisure to come to us too. You may be sure you shall have a letter from thence. Lord Fitzwilliam will tell you all the politics. When he comes to the meeting between the Duke of Bedford and Lord Rockingham, and their entirely breaking and separating, you will expect, may-be, as I did, that he would come into *administration cum suis*, but no. The Duke of Grafton is *forced*, and if he has a grain of spirit must go on, and believe me, Charles, if he does, there will be no difficulty whatever. Lord Chatham, I hear, is worse, who was bad enough before, and let me assure you, in spite of all newspapers, *Lord Bute has nothing to do.* It is generally thought the Duke of Bedford will grow stone blind. Rigby was expressing his great concern, when a friend of yours said, it would give him more if his Grace opened his eyes. Well! If he is blind, there are people accustomed enough to see for him.

"All my things are come from Naples. I shall make Kings-

[1] Sackville, eighth earl of Thanet, married on the 30th August, 1767, Mary, only daughter of Lord John Sackville.

gate very pretty for you, and have almost fixed upon a plan for a new house, where I hope you will spend many happy hours after I am dead and gone. I hope to spend a few with you soon, and upon my word, I think of none, with anything like pleasure, but those I love, and you most sincerely.

"Adieu.

"Yours ever most affectionately,

"HOLLAND."

Although the letter given above relates to the feelings of Lord Holland rather than to those of his son Charles, and although it exhibits a lamentable picture of the declining years of a statesman, who, notwithstanding his natural good sense and affectionate disposition, had the folly to set his heart upon such foolish and unworthy objects as mere Court favor and empty titles, I have yet transcribed it in these memorials of Mr. Fox's youth, because it contrasts strongly the petty and miserable objects, which in the outset of life he was taught by his parents, associates, and situation to value, with those which his own vigorous mind, better experience, and enlarged benevolence, in his riper years, preferred and determined steadily and disinterestedly to pursue.

It is indeed strange that Lord Holland should have felt, and still more that he should have inspired such a mind as his son's with so earnest a desire to convert his dignity of Baron to that of Earl, for I suspect it is the disappointment of such despicable ambition to which the early part of his letter alludes. It shows, however, in other parts, some better and more amiable feelings. It expresses unaffectedly his real tenderness for his son, and displays the easy confidential footing on which they lived together, and the high opinion, indicated by the unreserved expression of his inmost feelings, which he entertained of the judgment of Charles.

C. J. FOX TO SIR GEORGE MACARTNEY.

"FLORENCE, 6*th August*, 1767.

"DEAR MACARTNEY:—

"By a letter I had from my mother yesterday, I heard of your return to England. I was sitting down this morning to write to you, when they brought me yours of the 21st July. You cannot imagine how much obliged to you I am for thinking of me so soon, at a time when you most undoubtedly have so much occupation of every kind. I should have written long ago, but ever since Mr. Stanley's appointment we were in continual expectation of your return, and even after Mr. Stanley's being made cofferer we were in total ignorance whether you continued at Petersburg or not. You will have been at Winterslow before you receive this, therefore I will say nothing of Lady Mary, but that, in my opinion, there is not another woman in England so capable of making my brother, or indeed any man happy, as she is. When you know her you will be charmed with her. What you say of my father's health must give all his friends the greatest satisfaction, for any one who has been absent for three years must undoubtedly be much more capable of judging of his looks than we who have seen him constantly: for my part, I am fully convinced that he owes his present good state of health to the climate of Naples,[1] and therefore hope he will not think of passing the next winter in England, though I know that a long journey, both to him and my mother, is a very disagreeable circumstance. I am very much pleased, though not at all surprised, at your manner of speaking of Lord Carlisle, and if you should ever be more acquainted with him you will find he answers in every respect to the good opinion you have conceived of him. I shall be very glad to hear from Mr. Selwyn, though it is so long since he has said he would write by

[1] Lord Holland inscribed on some votive tablet in his garden at this time, Ob salutem in Italiâ recuperatam.—J. R.

the next post, that I almost despair of his writing at all. As for politics, I am very little curious about them, for almost everything I hear at this distance seems unintelligible. I am ill-natured enough to be very sorry whenever I hear there is any chance of the Bedfords being pleased, and that is all I care about. In the last letter I received from you, before that I have now before me, you were so good as to inquire what studies I had pursued at Oxford. To tell you the truth, I have read a great deal since you left England, and have learnt nothing. I employed almost my whole time at Oxford in the mathematical and classical knowledge, but more particularly in the latter, so that I understand Latin and Greek tolerably well. I am totally ignorant in every part of useful knowledge. I am more convinced every day how little advantage there is in being what at school and the university is called a good scholar: one receives a good deal of amusement from it, but that is all. At present I read nothing but Italian, which I am immoderately fond of, particularly of the poetry. You, who understand Italian so well yourself, will not at all wonder at this. As to French, I am far from being so thorough a master of it as I could wish, but I know so much of it that I could perfect myself in it at any time with very little trouble, especially if I pass three or four months in France. I should not run on in this manner about myself if I were not convinced that you did not mean a mere compliment when you desired me to give some account of myself, but that you are really so good as to interest yourself in what concerns me. Believe me, my dear Macartney, your being in England, besides the pleasure I shall have from your company, will be of infinite service to me. I want such an example as yours to make me conquer my natural idleness, of which Lady Holland will tell you wonders. Indeed, I am afraid it will in the end get the better of what little ambition I have, and that I never shall be anything but a lounging fellow. As to you, you will be entering next year into a way of life quite new to you, and I make no doubt but your *début* in the House of Commons will be as brilliant as it was at Petersburg, which last everybody's

mouth was full of about a year ago, though by this time it is probably forgotten, as everything in England is, on account of the quick succession of events which are continually arising to direct the public attention. Adieu, dear Macartney; let me have the continuance of your friendship, for there is nothing in the world I set a more invaluable price upon."

C. J. FOX TO RICHARD FITZPATRICK.

"FLORENCE, *September* 22, 1767.

"DEAR RICHARD:—

"I do not know how it happened, but your letter of July 21 did not come to me till about a fortnight ago. You will very probably have left Caen[1] long before this reaches you; if so, I shall lose a little of my time, and there is no harm in that. I fancy we may defer for some time the thoughts of our St. Alban's[2] suppers. I shall certainly not be in England before next summer, if then; and as for Carlisle, I suppose he will then be setting out for his travels, if he goes on in the drawling way he has done hitherto. You will have heard, to be sure, of his green ribbon, and have been as much pleased with it as I was. *I think it one of the best things that has been done this great while.* Were you in England when his 'Spendthrift'[3] came out? No. It was, in my opinion, with all due respect to Mr. Fitzpatrick, much the best that appeared. I forgot what the seventeenth number was that you commend so.

"Your letter has put me in mind of acting, and made me extremely eager for some more plays, though, to tell you the truth, the last time I acted I fell very short of my own expectations. However, my spirit is not entirely broken, but I will avoid appearing in any very conspicuous part, if possible. Your sister is a very good actress. Lady Sarah's fame is well known. Ste[4]

[1] Fitzpatrick was *en pension* at that town, where he learnt French and attended the Military Academy.—V. H.

[2] The tavern, I conclude, in St. Alban's-street.—V. H.

[3] Probably some periodical paper of 1767.

[4] Stephen Fox, his brother.

acted extremely well in the comedy; in the tragedy, he did not know his part. Carlisle is not an excellent actor, but will make a very useful one. Dickson acted the small part he had in the tragedy very ill, chiefly, I believe, from carelessness. He acted one or two scenes in the comedy inimitably, and all well. He will be of great use to us. Peter Brodie is the best manager prompter in the world. We want another actor or two, but much more another actress. There are very few comedies that do not require above two women. Lady Mary's *grossesse* and Salisbury election so entirely engross all my brother's thoughts at present, that he does not so much as mention acting in any one of his letters, but I hope his enthusiasm (for such it was last year) will return. Indeed it will be very absurd if he has built a theatre for nothing. You may tell my brother I can get two actors for him, one goodish, and one baddish; I have not engaged them, but I know I can have them. I have so bad a taste as to differ from you very much about the French stage. I allow the French actors to be much better than ours, but I think our plays are infinitely better. Here at Florence the people are clever at every other species of writing imaginable but the dramatic. All Italian plays are imitations either of Greek, Latin, or French ones, but if the Italians are in this respect inferior to the French, English, &c., they are fully revenged in every other. For God's sake learn Italian as fast as you can, if it be only to read Ariosto. There is more good poetry in Italian than in all other languages that I understand put together. In prose, too, it is a very fine language. Make haste and read all these things, that you may be fit to talk to Christians. Fitzwilliam is here, and, as you may imagine, we live a great deal together. Adieu, dear Richard; my letter is rather too long."

C. J. FOX TO RICHARD FITZPATRICK.

"Nice, 23*d January*, 1768.

"Dear Richard:—

"When I arrived at this place about six weeks ago, I found a letter from you. You cannot think how glad I am you think of acting, for I was afraid it would have been put off this year, and in that case it would probably have been entirely dropped. My modest paragraph, as you call it, was not affectation, for I really did not act near as well as I expected, but my expectations, it must be confessed, were very high. If you think of acting in August or September, you may count upon me, as I intend to be in England by the very beginning of August. The two actors I mentioned were Price[1] and Fitzwilliam. The former has appeared with great success, in the part of Gloucester, in 'Jane Shore,' though in Alonzo, in the 'Revenge,' he lost much of the credit he had gained. He is really an agreeable man, and I think you would like him extremely. You will oblige me very much if you will put him up at Almack's till he is chosen, without minding how many black balls he has. Pray do not blackball him yourself. He is now in Italy, and returns to England in summer, therefore I should be glad he were chosen this winter. As to Fitzwilliam, he says he should like to act, but I do not believe he will, and I think he would make a bad actor. Carlisle is gone to Turin to meet his ribbon. Kildare, who has been upon a visit to us, is gone with him, so we are now quite alone. We live a small distance from Nice, which is the dullest town in the world. Je travaille toujours le matin, and in the evening, read, lounge, play at chess, and talk. I leave this place in April, and go somewhere to meet Carlisle. I made some verses about a year ago, just after you left England, but I do not send them as my brother has them, and may show you them if you want to see them. Have you made anything in that way? Carlisle has

[1] Uvedale Price.

made two epitaphs on Rose which please me extremely. Adieu, my dear Richard.

"P. S. I hear the stage in England is worse than ever. Remember me to your brother. I hope the report of his being to be made a peer is true."

MR. FOX TO MR. FITZPATRICK.

"From the time that I left you, dear Richard, at Almacks,
(For which I have no rhyme but the old one of Calmucks,)
I slept while I came a confounded slow pace,
Till at last I arrived about eight at this place.
From hence we are now just about to embark,
And hope to reach Calais before it is dark;
I begin, I can tell you, already to curse
The engagements I made to write always in verse.
For the Muses are coy, and the more that I woo 'em
The more difficult 'tis, as I find, to get to 'em;
They are whimsical women, but spite of their malice
I will send you a letter to-morrow from Calais."

EXTRACT OF A LETTER FROM MR. UVEDALE PRICE TO MR. ROGERS, IN SEPTEMBER, 1814.

"My stay at Geneva was short. I was then travelling with Charles Fox, who wrote to Voltaire to beg he would allow us to come. He very civilly answered, the name of Fox was sufficient, though he received hardly any visitors, et que nous venions pour l'interrer. He did not ask us to dine with him, but conversed a short time, walking backward and forward in his garden, gave us some chocolate, and dismissed us. I am sorry to give you so meagre an account, but all I can recollect of his conversation, and that a mere nothing, is that, after giving us a list of some of his works, which he thought might open our minds, and free them from any religious prejudices, he said, 'voilà des livres dont il faut se munir.'"

BOOK THE SECOND.

1768.

[For the second of the periods into which these collections are divided, some of the materials are derived from the manuscript memoirs and journals of Horace Walpole. These papers,] "the property of Lord Waldegrave, were lent to me," says Lord Holland, "and have been long in my possession. I copy, as permitted by Lord Waldegrave, all relating to Mr. Charles Fox from them." The memoirs extend through the years 1768, 1769 [1770 and 1771, after which the manuscript collections of Mr. Walpole are continued under the title of journals].

[Extracts from the Walpole papers have generally the initials "H. W." at the foot of each paragraph, and where the words are copied verbatim they are printed within inverted commas. Extracts from other journals and correspondence, and observations by Lord Holland, have no distinctive marks annexed to them. The additions of Mr. Allen are, as usual, within brackets.]

[Lord Holland had copied into his original collections every syllable written by Horace Walpole, after the commencement of 1768, that related to his uncle, or to his grandfather, and wherever he found charges and insinuations against them, which, in his opinion, were malignant and unfounded, he has subjoined such answers as his knowledge of the transactions enabled him to give. It has been thought unnecessary to include in the present collection the whole of these passages. It is impossible not to be sensible of the valuable services which Mr. Walpole's sprightly correspondence and labored memoirs have rendered to the history

of the last century, both in respect to the manners of the age and to the political intrigues of the times. But no man is less to be trusted than Mr. Walpole, when he either praises a friend or abuses an enemy. He was a gossip, credulous and spiteful. He relates every story he hears, and, without examining into its truth, explains it as best suits his prejudices of the moment. With the first Lord Holland, as the last eminent survivor of those who had adhered to his father, he was for many years on the most intimate and friendly terms. But having betrayed, as he relates and justifies in his published memoirs, the confidence reposed in him by Mr. Fox at a very important crisis, their confidential intercourse had ceased, and it is manifest that, being no longer trusted by him, he is consequently often mistaken in the motives he assigns for his conduct. In October, 1762, Mr. Fox had been prevailed upon to undertake the defence of the peace with France, for which Mr. Grenville was thought inadequate; and, in the execution of that task, he had recommended and pursued a system of intimidation, if not persecution, alike repugnant to his own nature and to the practice of the English government for the last forty years, but necessary in his opinion to break the formidable aristocracy which had ruled the kingdom during that period.[1] In consequence of this change in his political system and connections, Lord Holland, as he soon after became, forfeited the friendship of the Duke of Cumberland, his early patron, and separated from his old friend, the Duke of Devonshire, and the other leaders of the Whig party. Horace Walpole sympathized with many who, he thought, had suffered unjustly from this persecution; and though Lord Holland, on the resignation of Lord Bute, withdrew from any active part in public affairs, what had been done inflamed Mr. Walpole with resentment, and made him ever after the bitter enemy of Lord Holland. Whatever rumors he heard, whatever gossip reached

[1] [It was said on this occasion, in allusion to the Duke of Newcastle's exertions in favor of the Hanover succession, that Lord Bute had turned out every man brought in by his Grace except the King.]—J. A.

his ears, to the prejudice of any member of the Fox family, he seized on with avidity, committed to paper without hesitation, and, without revision or subsequent correction, bequeathed as historical facts to posterity. Much caution and reserve are, therefore, necessary in quoting from his works, where Lord Holland or his sons are concerned. When he speaks with admiration of the precocious talents of Mr. Fox, his testimony may be credited, because his political partialities, as well as his personal prejudices, were all the other way. Where he paints his dissipation and enlarges on his extravagance, the tales he relates are worth preserving, as consonant to general tradition, and conformable to what has been handed to us of the manners and character of the age. But the false coloring, and misrepresentation of facts, with which he gives pungency to his narrative, it would be idle to repeat for the mere purpose of exposing and refuting them.]

Mr. Fox was returned for Midhurst in the parliament which met on the 10th May, 1768. He was then only nineteen years and four months old. He sat and spoke before he was of age.

1769.

[As he was absent from England when the Parliament met, he did not take his seat till the second session, which began in the following November. His first speech appears, from Sir Henry Cavendish's debates, to have been made on the 9th March, 1769, when he was little more than twenty years old. He spoke again on the 14th April, and a third time on the 8th May.[1] His

[1] I have in my possession a singular proof of the figure and impression Mr. Fox made on his first appearance as an orator. A young artist, and, I believe, a reporter of debates, a Mr. Surtees, of Maniforth, in the county of Durham, happened to be in the gallery when he first spoke. At that period no stranger was allowed to make notes, or take any paper or notebook into the gallery for that purpose. But this gentleman, struck with the appearance of the youthful orator, tore off part of his shirt, and sketched on it, with a pencil or burnt stick, a likeness of him, which he afterwards tried to finish at his lodgings, and which, owing to the care of

first speech seems to have been nothing more than a few words on a point of order; his second was in support of the expulsion of Wilkes; his third on the petition against the return of Colonel Luttrel for Middlesex; the two last on the side of government. None of these speeches are reported well or at length, but they seem to have made a favorable impression on his audience.] Horace Walpole alludes in terms of qualified praise to the second, in his account of the debates of the 14th and 15th April, which, as usual, he jumbles together and confounds in one. "Norton, Lord North, and the Attorney-General De Gray, spoke firmly for Luttrel. Stephen Fox indecently and indiscreetly said, 'Wilkes had been chosen by the scum of the earth,' an expression after retorted on his family, his grandfather's birth being of the lowest obscurity. Young Payne (Sir Ralph), in a pompous oration, abused the supporters of the Bill of Rights, protesting on his honor that his speech was not premeditated, but, forgetting part, he inadvertently pulled it out of his pocket in writing. Charles Fox, with infinite superiority in parts, was not inferior to his brother in insolence."—H. W.

[To this speech, his father, Lord Holland, alludes in a letter to Mr. Campbell of Cawdor, with the partiality perhaps of a parent, but which the extorted praise of Horace Walpole goes far to justify, "I am told that few in Parliament ever spoke better than Charles did on Tuesday—off-hand—with rapidity, with spirit, and such knowledge of what he was talking of as surprised everybody in so young a man. If you think this vanity, I am sure you will forgive it."] [Of his speech of the 8th May there is a short notice in a letter from Sir Richard Heron to Sir Charles Bunbury, who was then at Paris, dated 9th May, 1769:] "I shall be happy to see you returned to your country, and assisting it in the Senate. Mr. Charles Fox, who I suppose was your school-fellow, and who is but twenty, made a great figure in the debate last night upon the petition of the Middlesex freeholders.

Mr. Sharpe and kindness of Mr. Fletcher, is still preserved in my possession at Holland House, retaining many traits of resemblance to the dark, intelligent, and animated features of Mr. Fox.—V. H.

He spoke with great spirit, in very parliamentary language, and entered very deeply into the question on constitutional principles." "Charles Fox," says Horace Walpole, in his account of this debate, "not yet twenty-one, answered Burke with great quickness and parts, but with confidence equally premature." [Of the whole debate on the 8th May and of the state of parties at that period, as they appeared to Lord Holland, there is preserved an interesting account in another letter of his to Mr. Campbell of Cawdor.]

LORD HOLLAND TO JOHN CAMPBELL, ESQ.

"*May* 11, 1769.

" DEAR SIR :—

"I delayed thanking you for your kind letter of April 27 till the Parliament should be up, which it was on Tuesday, after a debate of Monday till two o'clock on Tuesday morning, in which I am told (and I willingly believe it) Charles Fox spoke extremely well. It was all off-hand, all argumentative, in reply to Mr. Burke and Mr. Wedderburne, and excessively well indeed. I hear it spoke of by everybody as a most extraordinary thing, and I am, you see, not a little pleased with it. My son Ste spoke too, and (as they say he always does) very short and to the purpose. They neither of them aim at oratory, make apologies, or speak of themselves, but go directly to the purpose, so I do not doubt they will continue speakers; but I am told Charles can never make a better speech than he did on Monday. I send you a list of the speakers and the members.[1] I hear Norton's speech was the best that ever was made, and convincing to the last degree. Lord Temple and Lord Shelburne, G. Grenville, Lord Rockingham and Lord Lyttleton, notwithstanding all their disagreements, are now thoroughly united to carry on the wicked work they have been always engaged in when they have not been in place, and dined together with the minority on Tuesday at the Thatched

[1] [The names of the speakers and members agree with the account in Sir H. Cavendish's Debates, and need not therefore be inserted.]

House, invited by Mr. Dowdeswell when they were all in the lobby.

"The King was extremely insulted when he went to the House, which I should hope might make him less unconcerned than he seems to be. He carries himself so it is hard to know whether he is concerned or not. A lord who is near him told me, that after the great riot at St. James's, or rather in the midst of it, when he came out to the *levée*, you could not find out, either in his countenance or his conversation, that everything was not quiet as usual. My notion of the mob is, that it is hired by French money, that D'Eon is a distributor of it, and that Lord Temple and Lord Shelburne encourage it.

"You are mistaken in thinking I could be of service if I was consulted, for I really cannot foresee the consequences nor the design of what they are about, and should therefore not know what to advise.

"Mr. Wilkes has quarrelled with his friends, because, he says, they divert the attention of the public from him. They do so, and I believe he is near meeting with his reward—a just contempt as well as abhorrence. But the spirit of disorder, licentiousness, and faction still continues, and whether it will be better or worse for not flowing from Mr. Wilkes's direction, I can't tell. You must observe I don't mention Lord Chatham. Nobody does now, and that is a step, as far as it goes, to your more favorable opinion of him. I believe Lord Temple has been telling lies these three months, and, no longer ago than last Sunday, assured several people that Lord Chatham had prevailed to have the prorogation of Parliament put off for three or four days, and would come down and speak; whereas the poor man has all the time been confined to his room, if not to his bed. If I knew nothing of Lord Temple but this profligate and scandalous lying disposition, I should hate him as I do.

"Except two or three days that I shall go to Kingsgate, I shall be to be found here, and never so happy as when found by you. You may then tell my sons what they desired me to ask you, whether you cared about the Pembrokeshire petition, and

what part you would have them to take in it. Did they get any instructions from Pembrokeshire at last? which I see is asserted in the newspapers. If they did not, I think the sheriff should advertise the falsity of it.

"Ever, dear Sir,

"Yours, most obliged and

"Most affectionate,

(Signed) "HOLLAND."[1]

When Mr. Fox was chosen for Midhurst, and during the whole of the ensuing session of 1768 and 1769, the Duke of Grafton was minister; but even during the early part of that period, although Lord Chatham was nominally his colleague, he had ceased to attend the cabinets, or even to communicate his view of public matters to the Duke of Grafton, who was embarrassed for want of his counsels, and alarmed at the absence of his support, and consequently obliged to look for assistance elsewhere, especially as the affair of Wilkes and the Middlesex election grew daily more perplexing and unpopular. He got more and more connected with the Bedfords, and was openly supported, especially in the business of Wilkes, by the family, friends, and followers of Lord Holland. On the 12th of October, 1768, Lord Chatham wrote to the [Duke of Grafton, imploring his Majesty's permission to resign the Privy Seal on the score of health, expressing at the same time his resentment at the usage received by his friends Sir Jeffrey Amherst and Lord Shelburne. With much reluctance and after a fruitless attempt from the King to prevail on him to withdraw his resignation, to which he replied by reiterating his supplication to be allowed to resign, his request was complied with.] He then resigned, and Lord Shelburne, to avoid dismission, says Horace Walpole, followed him. Lord Camden, Lord Chatham's friend, remained Chancellor; and Lord Bristol, reputed so hitherto, was appointed Privy

[1] The letter is signed by Lord Holland, but written, as all or most of his are in 1769, in another hand.

Seal; and Lord Rochford Secretary of State. Lord Chatham was soon after, through the means, says Walpole, of Calcraft, reconciled to Lord Temple and Mr. Grenville, and in opposition. Such was the state of parties when Mr. Fox first entered Parliament and took a part in the debates.—V. H.

I am not sure through what interest Lord Holland bought, as I am confident he must have done, the seat at Midhurst. But Mr. Fox came in for that borough, no doubt, in the character of a supporter of Government, and his father was throughout 1768 and 1769, not only on the side of Government, but a bitter and eager opponent of Mr. Wilkes, as may be inferred from the votes of his sons and from his own private letters.

[Among many letters indicating the political tendency of Lord Holland's opinions at this period, the following extract from one of his letters to Mr. Campbell of Cawdor deserves insertion. It shows under what political impressions Mr. Fox made his entrance into public life, and it is curious, besides, as a just tribute to Lord Chatham from his old political rival and opponent. It was written from Nice, on the 20th of April, 1768, at the time when the return of Mr. Wilkes from exile had been followed by his first election for Middlesex.]—"Irresolution," Lord Holland observes, "has been a general fault, and is surely a most fatal weakness. I think Pitt almost the only man that I have seen in power, who had not that *fault*, though he had many *others;* for which reason I wish he were again well, and for the first time in my life, should be glad to see him at the head of everything, undertaking to stem that torrent which he has so long and so much contributed to swell." [Pitt *did* get well, but he took a part directly opposite to that which Lord Holland seems to have anticipated.]

[Lord Holland and his sons took a warm and active part in support of Colonel Luttrel. Stephen Fox proposed him on the hustings, and at Holland House a great breakfast had been prepared for the troop of gentlemen who were to have escorted him to Brentford; but a mob that assembled before his father, Lord Irnham's door, compelled these gallants to disperse and make

their escape, as they could, by breaking an opening through the garden-wall behind the house. This prominent and undisguised opposition to their idol exasperated the city and the populace against Lord Holland and his family. Petitions and denunciations from the Middlesex electors, letters and speeches from the Lord Mayor and Alderman Beckford, threats from the Livery, and instructions given to their representatives to institute a parliamentary inquiry into the conduct of Lord Holland, and, if matter was found, to impeach him, followed in succession, but, as Horace Walpole[1] concludes his account of these transactions, "it came to nothing," and their silence cleared him.]

[On the 9th of October following, Lord and Lady Holland, with their sons, Charles and Henry, went abroad with Lady Cecilia Lennox (Lady Holland's sister), who had been ordered to the continent for her health. She was unable to proceed farther south than Paris, where she died on the 13th of November. The rest of the party remained at Paris till the end of the year, when Charles and Henry returned to England, and Lord and Lady Holland went on to Nice. During his stay at Paris, Mr. Fox made himself remarked for his losses at play. His mother appears, from her correspondence, to have been elated with the fashionable society in which he lived, but if Madame Du Deffand[2] does not exaggerate, he paid well for it.]

1770.

[Mr. Crawford, who accompanied Mr. Fox and his brother on their return from Paris in January, 1770, told Lord Holland, in 1813, that] "they arrived in London the night before Parliament met, that Mr. Fox sat up all night at the Star and Garter, and made his maiden speech next day in answer to Sir George Saville." [That the speech he made on his return from Paris with Mr. Crawford, was not his maiden speech, has been already shown. On the debate of the 9th of January (which must be the one

[1] MS. Memoirs.

[2] Letters to Horace Walpole, 10th and 26th December, 1769.

meant by Mr. Crawford)], Walpole says, that after Conway had answered Sir George Saville with wisdom and temper, "though Charles Fox replied (to Saville that is) with much applauded fire, moderation had made its impression."—H. W.

"On the debate of the 25th of January," says Walpole, "young Charles Fox, of age the day before, started up and entirely confuted Wedderburne even in law, producing a case decided in the courts below but the last year, and exactly similar to that of Wilkes. The court, he said, had had no precedent, but had gone on analogy. *The house roared with applause.*"—H. W. [In the following month,[1] Mr. Fox was appointed one of the Lords of the Admiralty. At the time of his admission to office, the contest between the party styling themselves the King's friends, and the survivors of those ministers who had governed the country in the latter years of George II., still raged with violence, though it was fast drawing to a close. It had subsisted during the administrations of Lord Bute, George Grenville, Lord Rockingham, and Lord Chatham, without any decisive victory on either side. Lord Chatham had entered on his second administration with every advantage he could desire.[2] Selected by the King in preference to Lord Rockingham and Mr. Grenville—idolized by the people, who recollected with pride and exultation the glories of his first administration—feared by the House of Bourbon, which, in all its branches, trembled at his name—he had the imprudence to sacrifice his popularity and station in the country for a peerage, to offend by his haughtiness and caprice the Whig aristocracy, without whom he was unable to form a stable government that could keep his enemies in awe—and, lastly, from bad health and waywardness of temper,[3] he abandoned the motley administration he had formed to the Duke of Grafton and Charles Townshend. In vain the Duke of Grafton applied to him for assistance and advice. In vain the King urged him

[1] February 24th.

[2] July, 1766.

[3] From bad health, as it now appears, affecting his mind as well as his body.—See Lord Mahon, vol. v. and vi.—J. R.

with earnestness, and with every appearance of sincerity, to undertake the direction of affairs. In his replies to the King he was humble and submissive in language, adulatory and even abject in his professions of personal regard and gratitude for his Majesty's condescension, but positive in his refusal to engage in business, for which his health, he alleged, rendered him utterly incapable. Once or twice he admitted the Duke of Grafton into his presence, but declined to converse with him on public affairs. When this farce had continued more than a year and a half, the Duke of Grafton, who had been relieved by death from the levity, versatility, and indiscretion of Charles Townshend,[1] formed a coalition with the partisans of the Duke of Bedford, and appointed Lord North his Chancellor of the Exchequer.[2] Lord Chatham remained in seclusion and retirement, nominally in office, but unable or unwilling to execute even the slight duties attached to the Privy Seal.]

[The minister, strengthened by the accession of the Bedford party, and hopeless of further aid from Lord Chatham, began to view the private friends Lord Chatham had introduced into office as persons that might be got rid of whenever it suited his convenience. Lord Bristol had retired from Ireland;[3] Sir Jeffrey Amherst was removed from Virginia; Lord Shelburne, after submitting to have his department curtailed by the appointment of a colonial secretary, found himself slighted, his nominations thwarted, and himself threatened with dismissal. Roused by these marks of disrespect, Lord Chatham resigned,[4] and in the month following his resignation he became reconciled to his brothers-in-law, Lord Temple and Mr. George Grenville, both of whom were in flaming opposition to the Government he had quitted. The session of Parliament that followed was marked by the repeated expulsions of Wilkes, and the outrageous resolution of the Commons that his competitor Luttrel was duly elected member for Middlesex. Lord Chatham was silent and

[1] September 4, 1767.
[2] December, 1767.
[3] July, 1767.
[4] October 14, 1768.

remained secluded during these discussions, but when the session was over he surprised the world by his reappearance at Court. He was courteously received and favored with an audience, but had no overtures made to him, or at least none that have ever transpired.]

[In the two following years, though occasionally disabled by gout, Lord Chatham appears to have recovered the ardor and activity of youth. Reconciled to George Grenville, and no longer severed from the Rockingham Whigs by his rooted distrust of the Duke of Newcastle, who died in 1768, he took the lead in opposition to the Government. His correspondence shows how confident he and his friends were of success. They had the city and metropolitan counties on their side. With much importunity they prevailed on the popular Lord Granby to retire from the command of the army. The Duke of Grafton was panic-stricken and resigned.[1] But the exertions of the Opposition, the measures they took, the motions they made, served only to consolidate the system they meant to overturn. The Court, after enjoying the humiliation of Lord Camden, who had lingered in office after most of his friends had retired, deprived him of the seals. Lord North, the successor of the Duke of Grafton, by his temper, good-humor, and readiness in debate, conciliated the Commons, while his indolence and facility made him and kept him for many years, in spite of himself, an instrument in the hands of the Court. The forwardness and presumption of Beckford, the Lord Mayor, though applauded by the city and approved of by Lord Chatham, disgusted and offended the sober-minded. Want of success in repeated motions against the

[1] [January 28, 1770. This event, which was quite unexpected, surprised every one.] "The Duke of Grafton's resignation appears to me unaccountable," writes Lady Holland from Nice; "I hope Lord North has courage and resolution. Charles being connected with him pleases me mightily. I have formed a very high opinion of his lordship, and my Charles will, I dare say, inspire him with courage." [Such was the service to which Mr. Fox, at his entrance into public life, was destined by the fond partiality of his parents.]—J. A.

minority was followed by its inevitable consequences. Disunion broke out in the Opposition camp. The moderation, and, what he called, the narrow genius of the Whig connection, dissatisfied and excited the contempt of Lord Chatham. "For myself," says he, "I am resolved to be in earnest for the public, and shall be a *scarecrow of violence* to the gentle warblers of the grove, the moderate Whigs, and temperate statesmen." But, like other political agitators, though he could rouse the passion, he could not regulate the petulance nor control the presumption of his followers. The self-willed demagogues in the city quarrelled with one another, and provoked him. The war, which, at the opening of the campaign, had commenced with vigor, languished before its close, and dwindled in the following session to speeches about the Falkland Isles, and to squabbles with the city magistrates, who had liberated some printers committed by the Commons. The death of Mr. Grenville had, in the mean while, deprived the Opposition of one of the ablest of their parliamentary leaders. His friends immediately slackened in their attendance, or abandoned their colors. The interested, despairing of success, made their bargain with the minister, and, before the session of 1771 was brought to a close, the government of Lord North might be considered as being firmly established.]

[How far, during these transactions, Lord Bute continued to advise and direct the Court in private, after he had retired from all public employments, has been a matter of dispute. The opinion of Lord Holland on the subject may be collected from the following observations, which he has left inserted in this part of his collections for the life of Mr. Fox.]

Horace Walpole, in a long and tiresome disquisition on Burke's "Causes of the present Discontents," enters into an inquiry of the degree of influence retained by Lord Bute after his resignation, in which he says Burke acquitted him of all influence; "a proof of credulity," says Horace Walpole, "instilled into him by Lord Holland, who always held that language." This passage implies, and, I believe, truly, that Mr. Burke was in the habit of seeing Lord Holland, to whom I think he was

introduced very early by Charles Fox, and who remarked of him that he supposed he was a wonderfully clever man, but that he did not like those clever fellows who could not plainly say "yes" or "no" to any question you asked them, alluding to Burke's excessive practice of talking. Lord Holland was right in the language he held about Bute. At least George the Third, at seasons and to persons where he had no reason to conceal the fact, declared he never saw in private nor communicated with Lord Bute but once after his promise not to consult with him or ask his advice on public affairs, and that was in the garden at Kew, where the Princess Dowager surprised and offended him by introducing Lord Bute to him unexpectedly. This I had from the Duke of York.

[It is clear from this passage that Lord Holland did not partake in the belief, very generally prevalent in his youth, that Lord Bute continued after his resignation to be the secret adviser and private director of the measures pursued by the Court. It is indeed extraordinary that such an opinion should have continued after the distinct and positive disclaimer of Lord Mountstuart, in the name of his father, on occasion of a silly attempt made by two officious intermeddlers to bring about a coalition between Lord Bute and Lord Chatham. Mr. Fox, then an active opponent of the American war, and in no way connected with Lord Bute or Lord Mountstuart, seems to have been satisfied with this disavowal, and to have drawn from it an inference which few persons, it is believed, would be nowadays bold enough to reject.] "I take it for granted," he says, in a letter to Mr. Fitzpatrick, "that you have read Dr. Addington's narrative and Lord Mountstuart's letter. What do you conclude from them? I am pigeon enough to believe Lord Bute, but what then? The consequence is still more unpleasant. If it is not Lord Bute who has done the mischief, it must be somebody else, whom it is still more impossible to remove."

[The opinion of the first Lord Holland, that subsequently to the formation of the Rockingham Administration Lord Bute was not consulted in private by the King, was most decided, and as

he lived in intimacy with Lord Bute, his belief on that point is of value.]

[In a letter to Mr. Welbore Ellis, of the 17th of October, he had said,] "I have seen Lord Bute this morning. Nothing can be more contrary to the truth than what you suspected at Kingsgate. He has had nothing to do in these affairs from the beginning. He has had no communication, nor means of communication, any more than if he were where the newspapers would send him. You know I never doubted of what he tells me upon his word; yet everything that displeases, of every kind, is thrown on him. He thought I blamed him; I fancy, thinks everybody blames him. He could tell me nothing. He knows nothing."

"I wonder," he says, in another letter to Mr. Welbore Ellis, of the 11th November, 1765, "you should not understand me. I say Lord B(ute) *has* no *communication nor means of communication*—I mean, in private—with the King. The King consulted the late Duke of Cumberland in March last, previously to his turning out the late Ministry, and has not consulted Lord Bute since. You may disbelieve, but you cannot misunderstand me now; and what you suspected at Kingsgate was that Lord Bute saw the King in private, and influenced everything. I then believed the first, but not the last."

1771.

[In 1771 the following notices of Mr. Fox are extracted from Mr. Walpole's Memoirs.]

11th February. On Sir William Meredith's bill to amend the Nullum Tempus Act, "the Court party were furious against the injustice, and seemed glad to be oppressed once, and made interest to defend the clause which the bill went to repeal. Charles Fox, the phenomenon of the age, undertook the patronage of it, and gave as much satisfaction to the party as disgust to the Opposition by the great talents he exerted on the occasion." —H. W.

18th March. On question for committing Lord Mayor, "Charles

Fox, as if impatient to inherit his father's unpopularity, abused the city as his father used to do, but Ministers were moderate." —H. W.

27th March. In a riot upon the Lord Mayor going to the House of Commons, in which Lord North was insulted and rescued "by Sir William Meredith, a generous enemy, and by Mr. La Roche, a friend,"—"the two Foxes were as rudely handled, and escaped as narrowly."—H. W.

10th April. "When Lord North opened the budget, T. Townshend reflected on Lord Holland as author of the proscriptions at the beginning of the reign. Charles Fox said he did not believe his father had had any hand in them, but if he had, it was right to break the power of the aristocracy that had governed in the name of the late King. Charles Fox asked me afterwards in private if the accusation against his father was just. I replied, I could not but say it was."—H. W.

In an investigation of the formation and progress of Mr. Fox's political principles, this little incident, mentioned by Walpole, is of more importance than at first sight it may appear. It raises an inference which other slight facts recorded by Walpole confirm, that Charles Fox, in his early years, even in the heat of party and personal contention in Parliament, was singularly attentive to the facts and maxims of his adversaries, and began very early to sift and examine the soundness of those doctrines in support of which accident and his father's situation had engaged him. Burke's pamphlet on the Discontents, his own familiarity with that very able man, and his observation and candor, gradually prepared his mind for the adoption of more generous, elevated, and sound principles of public conduct than those which had been instilled into him; and his father's ill health and death, and his own quarrel and separation from Ministers, fomented the growth of such sentiments.—V. H.

1772.

6th January, 1772. "Charles Fox, whose ambition was checked by the inactivity in Parliament, gave notice in the House of Commons that he intended, on that day fortnight, to make a motion for the repeal of the Marriage Act, in order to bring in a new bill. His father, Lord Holland, had distinguished himself in the late reign by his animated opposition to that bill." "When he moved this repeal he had not read the Marriage Act, nor did he till some days after. A few evenings before he had been at Brompton on two errands; one to consult Justice Fielding on the penal laws, the other to borrow 10,000*l.*, which he brought to town at the hazard of being robbed. As the gaming and extravagance of young men of quality had arrived now at a pitch never heard of, it is worth while to give some account of it. They had a club at Almack's, in Pall Mall, where they played only for rouleaux of 50*l.* each, and generally there was 10,000*l.* in specie on the table. Lord Holland had paid above 20,000*l.* for his two sons. Nor were the manners of the gamesters, or even their dresses for play, undeserving notice. They began by pulling off their embroidered clothes and put on frieze greatcoats, or turned their coats inside outwards for luck. They put on pieces of leather (such as are worn by footmen when they clean the knives) to save their laced ruffles; and to guard their eyes from the light and to prevent tumbling their hair, wore high-crowned straw hats with broad brims and adorned with flowers and ribbons; masks to conceal their emotions when they played at quinze. Each gamester had a small neat stand by him, to hold their tea, or a wooden bowl with an edge of ormolu to hold their rouleaux. They borrowed great sums of Jews at exorbitant premiums. Charles Fox called his outward room, where those Jews waited till he rose, his Jerusalem Chamber."—H. W.

7th February. Upon a petition presented by Sir W. Meredith, and signed by 250 clergymen, complaining of the subscription to 39 articles (a petition, indirectly encouraged by Law, Bishop of

Carlisle), in the debate "Charles Fox declared for rejecting the petition, but for doing something with regard to the Universities. Religion, he said, was best understood when least talked of."—H. W.

On 17th, upon a bill moved by Mr. H. Seymour, for quieting the subjects against dormant claims of the Church, "Charles Fox, oppressed with debts and impatient to distinguish himself, seized the occasion presented by Lord North, and fell violently on the new doctrine of a member's beginning by stating the clauses of a bill when first moved for; he called it most unparliamentary and arbitrary, espoused the motion, and the rather, he affirmed, because no particular grievance pressed, and because no one parliamentary reason had been alleged why the bill should not be brought in; yet Mr. Seymour, he believed, would have great difficulties to remove before the bill could be made perfect. The bill was rejected by only 141 to 117, a very small majority in such a session. Charles Fox, his brother, and several other ministerial men, were in the minority."—H. W.

"On the 20th February, Charles Fox resigned his place at the Admiralty."—H. W. [His motives for this step are best explained in the following letter, partly from himself and partly from Mr. Crawford, to Lord Ossory—

"ALMACKS, *Thursday*, 21*st February*, 1772.

"MY DEAR OSSORY:—

"You will be surprised at the news I am going to tell you. Charles this day resigned. He had not any one particular reason for this step, but upon the whole he thought Lord North did not treat him with the confidence and attention he used to do. I think Charles had reason to be dissatisfied, but from what I have heard of his conversation with Lord North, who was very ready to take all blame upon himself, and expressed the greatest desire to keep him, I think he has been too hasty in a step of this consequence. But I believe he had mentioned his intention of resigning before he spoke to Lord North, and then was ashamed to retract. It is better to err by too much spirit than by too little,

and as Charles does not mean to go into opposition, and is always worth a better place than what he had, it is my opinion that what he has done will do him credit, and turn out to his advantage every way."

Then follows in Mr. Fox's own hand:—

"My dear Ossory:—

"It is impossible to tell you the real reason of my resigning, it is very complicated, and arises from so many different circumstances. I should not have resigned at this moment merely on account of my complaints against Lord North, if I had not determined to vote against this *Royal Family Bill,* which in place I should be ashamed of doing. Upon the whole I am convinced I did right, and I think myself very safe from going into opposition, which is the only danger. I am convinced, if you were to know the whole state of the case, I should have your approbation, which, I can assure you, would make me very happy.

"I am, my dear Ossory,

"Yours most affectionately,

"C. J. FOX."

Then resumed by Mr Crawford:—

"This is better than anything I could have said upon this subject. Charles's bill will not come on until after the Royal Family Bill is over, so that you need not come up on that account till you hear further from me. Pray remember me kindly to Lady Ossory, and believe me ever sincerely,

"Yours,

"J. CRAWFORD.

"P. S.—I don't know if what I wrote of Charles ought to please him or not, but he came in here when I left off, and I called him to me to read what I had wrote, and bid him write his own story, if he did not like mine."]

[Mr. Walpole thinks his resignation] *was probably by direction of his father* [on which Lord Holland remarks] that this con-

jecture is neither probable nor true. Mr. Fox resigned from some degree of personal discontent with Lord North, but chiefly and mainly because he was determined to oppose the Royal Marriage Act, and whatever cause of ill-humor my grandfather might have, it was not probable from the habits of his life that he would indulge it by resigning and going into opposition. I have heard he was much dissatisfied with his son for doing so, and though I cannot prove that fact, it seems to me much more probable than Mr. Horace Walpole's unfounded conjecture.

[The reasons given by Mr. Walpole, why the father should have advised the son to resign, are, his dissatisfaction at not obtaining his earldom—the slight given to his brother, Lord Ilchester, by the neglect of Lord North, who had not even replied to a letter from Lord Ilchester, soliciting a place for his son-in-law, O'Brien—and the refusal of a peerage to his friend Mr. Upton], "an additional reason" [says Walpole] "for its being believed that the father had influenced the son's resignation, though the father denied it;" [on which Lord Holland again remarks] Why should the father deny it, if it was true, and done with a view of extorting favors? The father knew too well that resignation was not the method to obtain those objects. It never had been his own practice, nor would he have recommended it to his son.

"Lord North," according to Walpole, "had much distinguished Charles Fox the last year, and had as much neglected him this; yet as soon as Fox had spoken against him, he weakly and timidly called him aside, and asked if he had seen Maclean, who had got the post which had been asked for O'Brien, and who would make O'Brien his deputy; but this Fox received with contempt. One of the Opposition triumphing on the acquisition of Fox from the Court, G. Selwyn said, 'You have no reason to triumph. You will be forced to pay his debts, as you did Wilkes's, or you will lose him again.'"[1]—H. W.

[1] A very natural observation for G. Selwyn, who, judging by the politicians with whom he had associated, could not easily imagine a man of liabilities in distress, who from public principle would abstain from repairing his fortune at the expense of his opinions.—V. H.

[On the very day Mr. Fox resigned] "was delivered the message from the King, recommending the Royal Marriage Act. Lord North and the Ministers were ridiculously alarmed [at this coincidence], and so much terrified by the defection of Mr. Fox and the disapprobation of others, that they obtained a mitigation of the Act, and brought it in the next day with an alteration, exempting the princes from positive prohibition of marriage after twenty-five years of age, and enabling them, after leaving a declaration for a year before Privy Council, to marry, unless Parliament made an objection."—H. W.

[It is notorious that the King himself was the originator and deviser of the Royal Marriage Act, and that it was forced on his Ministers much against their will]. In a note dated 26th February, while the bill was pending in the House of Lords, the King writes to Lord North: "I expect every nerve to be strained to carry the bill. It is not a question relating to Administration, but personally to myself; therefore I have a right to expect a hearty support from every one in my service, and I shall remember defaulters."[1] It is quite clear from these words that no man in office could have voted against the Royal Marriage Bill. Indeed it is pretty clear that, whether in or out of office, those who voted against it incurred the implacable displeasure of George III. He executed his threat of remembering defaulters. "His implacability against those who opposed the Marriage Bill," says Walpole, "proved it was his own act."

25th February. "On a motion for expunging thanks to Dr. Nowell for a sermon vindicating Charles I., which was carried by 151—42, General Keppel, Colonel Fitzroy, and Charles Fox, all descendants of Charles I., voted against the sermon, as did even Dyson,[2] and many courtiers."—H. W.

9th March. "Charles Fox was not only very temperate, but profuse of incense to Lord North on the stand he had made

[1] MS. Correspondence with Lord North.

[2] Jeremiah Dyson said, "If King Charles's grandsons vote against it, sure I may."—H. W.

against Opposition, and of his grief for differing with him. Lord North was not ungrateful, but returned Fox's flattery with interest, and not without ridicule, from being so exaggerated, and from being proof of his fear."—H. W.

[The extreme interest taken by Mr. Walpole in the Royal Marriage Act arose from the marriage of his niece with the Duke of Gloucester; being supposed, with the marriage of the Duke of Cumberland to Mrs. Horton, to have been the chief motives that determined George III. to insist with such earnestness on that measure; and as the part taken by Mr. Fox against the bill is supposed to have made a lasting impression against him at Court, it has been thought proper to extract from Mr. Walpole's Journal the running commentary he has given of Mr. Fox's conduct throughout the discussion.]

11th March. The parties on the Royal Marriage Bill classed in three distinct bodies: 1st, "against principle," composed of "Sir William Meredith, the Shelburne faction, and on this occasion the Foxes;" the 2d division were for going into the committee "with views to amendments;" the 3d, "the ministerial squadron, who desired to send the bill to the committee for form," but with no intention of altering it. "Ste Fox, in patriot terms, complained of the enormity of recurring to history for precedents. Charles Fox was so inoffensive, that, as Burke said afterwards, the dissent of some gentlemen was the opposition of half an hour."—H. W.

On 13th March, the House of Commons in committee on Royal Marriage Bill, Charles Fox attacked the Rockingham party, saying "he was not surprised they were going into the preamble, as they did not know how to attain their ends, and always defeated their own purposes."—H. W.

On the preamble of same bill, "Charles Fox made a greater figure than ever, chiefly at the expense of Sir Fletcher Norton, whose dreaded abilities he held in contempt. But he first blamed Lord North for having said indiscreetly, on the preced-

ing day, that there were 300 members to 64 who had declared the bill to be agreeable to law, yet many of the 300 had entered their protest against being included in that opinion. He himself had ever thought the bill odious; he thought it ten times more so since he had heard Sir Fletcher's doctrines. It was the more odious from the uncertainty under which he had left it—that glorious uncertainty, said he, which always attends the law.[1] Had any gentleman explained the term, Descendants of the Royal Family? He would answer, No. He had been told that particular care had been taken to find out the person who solemnized the Duke of Cumberland's marriage, for what purpose he knew not. This, and much more, he uttered with great warmth, energy, and applause."—H. W.

Horace Walpole classes "Charles Fox's logic with Burke's oratory and Conway's energy," as constituting the force of opposition to the bill.—H. W.

16th March. "Charles Fox said no decent reason had been given why the words should not be Descendants of George III., not George II. He was not clear the bill had not a retrospective view. He spoke on with great force, though less applauded than the preceding day."—H. W.

On the 18th March, "Charles Fox proposed to leave out the words '*other than the issue of princesses married into foreign families,*' and to substitute the words '*being a subject of Great Britain;*' because, as he showed, foreigners could not be bound by our laws, and that foreign families would take in so many cases that there would be more danger of foreign wars even than of domestic."—H. W.

"Charles Fox persisted in asking whether persons not subjects of England came within the act?"—H. W.

"Charles Fox urged that, while the lawyers contradicted one another, it was in vain to say, as Wedderburne maintained, that the line was ascertained. This would be the first time that ever a penal law was passed with the lawyers differing."—H. W.

[1] His father, Lord Holland, too, had always great pleasure in attacking the lawyers.—H. W.

"Charles Fox said the occasion (of the Royal Marriage Bill) was pitiful and disgraceful. Did the dignity of the Crown consist in the marriages of the Royal Family? He then, perceiving the Ministers would not argue, yet maintained the clause, said artfully, he perceived Lord North's friends had abandoned his defence."—H. W.

20th March. "Charles Fox asked Lord North with what face he could tell him that a prince, who should contract a marriage contrary to this bill, would not be guilty of a præmunire. That clause was a tacit confession of the weakness of the nullity."—H. W.

"But a more remarkable secret came out. Very few days before the conclusion of the Royal Marriage Bill, young Mr. Crawford, mentioned above, told me this story. He gave a dinner to his countryman, Mr. Wedderburne, the Solicitor-General, to Charles Fox, and others. They got drunk, and, in his cups, Wedderburne blabbed that he and Thurlow had each drawn the plan of an unexceptionable bill, but that Lord Mansfield had said they were both nonsense, had rejected them, and then himself drew the present bill; 'and damn him,' added Wedderburne, 'when he called my bill nonsense, did he think I would defend him?' In the course of the debates, I have given very inadequate ideas of the speeches of Burke, and Charles Fox, and Wedderburne, three excellent orators in different ways. I could only relate what I heard at second-hand, and from notes communicated to me, which must be imperfect when not taken in short-hand. Burke's wit, allusions, and enthusiasm, were striking but not imposing; Wedderburne was a sharp, clever arguer, though unequal; Charles Fox, much younger than either, was universally allowed to have seized the just point of argument throughout with most amazing rapidity and clearness, and to have excelled even Charles Townshend as a Parliament man, though inferior in wit and variety of talents."

"Enough of that bill—never was an act passed *against* which so much and *for* which so little was said."—H. W.

[Frequent mention has been made in these collections of Mr.

Crawford, as an early acquaintance and associate of Mr. Fox. He was a man of parts and vivacity, had been a favorite with Voltaire, and lived to be the friend of Calonne. He was well known for many years in the fashionable world, where his curious and prying disposition procured him the nickname of *the Fish*, by which he was habitually designated in society. He sat in several Parliaments, and once he attempted to speak. Of his failure on that occasion, he gives a sprightly account in a letter to Ste Fox, with whom and Lord Ossory, as more nearly of the same age, he was on more intimate habits than with Mr. Fox. As this letter alludes to a distinguishing feature in Mr. Fox's character, which was never to desert a friend at a pinch, it deserves insertion.]

MR. CRAWFORD TO STEPHEN FOX.

"Grafton Street.

"In all distresses of our friends,
Kind nature, ever bent to ease us,
Finds out some circumstance to please us.
How patiently we hear them groan!
How glad the case is not our own!

"I know, dear Ste, that you will be delighted to hear that I had the misfortune to speak a few days ago in the House of Commons. If I was the oldest and dearest friend you had in the world, you could not have wished me to succeed worse than I did. It was a prepared speech, ill-timed, ill-received, ill-delivered, languid, plaintive, and everything as bad as possible. Add to all this, that it was very long, because, being prepared and pompously begun, I did not know how the devil to get out of it. I know this news will give you great pleasure, and it is out of perfect kindness that I send it to you. The only thing I said, which was sensible or to the purpose, was misrepresented by Burke. Charles was not ashamed to acknowledge me in my distress. He explained and defended what I had said with spirit, warmth, and great kindness to me. I am really more pleased at having received a proof of kindness from Charles, whom I admire

and love more and more every day, than I am hurt at not succeeding in a thing in which I had no right to succeed. For certainly it was not the intention of Nature that I should be a public speaker, and I shall never attempt it any more. *Hic finis Priami fatorum*—I shall have the pleasure of seeing you some time next week in my way to Bath. I hope Lady Mary will not receive me the worse for not being an orator, or rather for having attempted to be one, which was a foolish mistake with regard to myself. All I have said is exactly true, and therefore I have no doubt of this being a very agreeable letter to you.

"For I am, and ever have been,

"Dear Ste,

"Your affectionate friend,

"J. C."

April 7. "Though I had never been in the House of Commons since I had quitted Parliament, the fame of Charles Fox raised my curiosity, and I went this day to hear him. He made his motion for leave to bring in a bill to correct the old Marriage Bill, and he introduced it with ease, grace, and clearness, and without the prepared or elegant formality of a young speaker. He did not shine particularly, but his sense and facility showed he could shine. He said the two great points of the former bill were to fix the notoriety of marriages, and to prevent improper marriages by establishing a nullity. He approved the first; he highly condemned the second. To encourage marriage by facilities was the business of a republican kind of government; but the late bill had been the work of a proud aristocracy, and he believed had hurt propagation, though he was not ready with proofs that it had. Colonel Burgoyne, a pompous man, whose speeches were studied, and yet not striking, seconded him. Lord North, who had declared he would not oppose the introduction of the new bill, now unhandsomely opposed it, to please the Yorkes and the peers, and spoke well. He said formerly the bill had been matter of speculation. It was no longer so; twenty years had shown its utility. It ought not to be laid aside unless

proofs could be brought that it had done hurt. T. Townshend supported the motion. Ellis, who owned he had been strongly against the old bill, said he had been converted to it on many points by Lord North's supporting it, but should not oppose considering how to amend it. Ongley and Cornwall were, the first for the old, the second for the new bill. Cornwall, a comely, sensible man, decent in his manner and matter, but of no vivacity. Burke made a long and fine oration against the motion. Burke was certainly in his principles no moderate man, and when his party did not interfere, generally leaned towards the more arbitrary side, as had appeared in the late debates on the Church, in which he had declared for the clergy. He laid his chief stress on the impropriety of allowing men to have children till they were of an age by strength and prudence to maintain them. He spoke with a choice and variety of language, a profusion of metaphors, and yet with a correction of diction, that were surprising. His fault was copiousness above measure; and he dealt abundantly, too much, in establishing general positions. Two-thirds of this oration resembled the beginning of a book on speculative doctrines, and yet argument was not the forte of it. Charles Fox, who had been running about the house talking to different persons and scarce listening to Burke, rose with amazing spirit and memory, answered both Lord North and Burke, ridiculed the arguments of the former, and confuted those of the latter with a shrewdness that, from its multiplicity of reasons, as much exceeded his father in embracing all the arguments of his antagonists, as he did in his manner and delivery.[1] Lord Holland was always confused before he could clear up the point, fluttered and hesitated, and wanted diction, and labored only one forcible con-

[1] He (Charles Fox) said ingeniously that the clandestine marriages made in Scotland had prevented some of the bad effects of the bill, and yet that he disliked those marriages, because by preventing those mischiefs they had prevented the repeal of the bill. He maintained what Burke denied, that it was an aristocratic bill: and he asked if it was the mildness of the aristocracy that had saved the bill when a repeal of it had twice passed the House of Commons.—H. W.

clusion. Charles Fox had great facility of delivery, his words flowed rapidly; but he had nothing of Burke's variety of language or correctness, nor his method, yet his arguments were far more shrewd. He was many years younger. Burke was indefatigable, learned, and versed in every branch of eloquence; Fox was dissolute, dissipated, idle beyond measure. He was that very morning returned from Newmarket, where he had lost some thousand pounds the preceding day; he had stopped at Hocherel, where he found company, had sat up all night drinking, and had not been in bed when he came to move his bill, which he had not even drawn up. This was genius, was almost inspiration. Being so very young, he appeared in that light a greater prodigy than the famous Charles Townshend. Townshend's speeches, for four or five years, gave little indication of his amazing parts: they were studied, pedantic, and like the dissertations of Burke, with less brilliancy. Charles Fox approached to Charles Townshend only in argument. Charles Townshend grew idle; he had taken pains; both could illuminate themselves from the slightest hints. But Townshend's wit exceeded even Burke's, and he could shine in every science, in every profession, with a quarter of Burke's application. All three were vain, and kept down by no modesty. Townshend knew his superiority over all men, and talked of it; Fox showed that he thought as well of himself; Burke endeavored to make everybody think so of him. Burke had most ambition and little judgment; Townshend, no judgment and most vanity; Fox, most judgment in his speeches, and none of Townshend's want of courage and truth. If Fox once reflects, and abandons his vices, in which he is as proud of shining as by his parts, he will excel Burke; for of all the politicians of talents that I ever knew, Burke has the least political art. None of the three were well calculated to command adherents. No man could trust or believe Townshend; and though he would flatter grossly, he would the next moment turn the same men into ridicule. Fox was too confident and overbearing; Burke had no address or insinuation. Men of less talents are more capable of succeeding by art, observation, and assiduity. The House dividing, Lord

North was beaten by 62 to 61, a disgraceful event for a Prime Minister. Since he would oppose Fox's motion contrary to his declaration, he ought to have taken care to have his members about him; but he daily showed that he was only a subservient minister. The Scotch cabal and the Tories could sway him as they pleased, and his negligence demonstrated that he followed their dictates, not his own objects. In fact, *he disliked his post*, and retained it only from hopes of securing some considerable emolument for his family. He was indolent, good-humored, void of affectation of dignity, void of art, and his parts and the goodness of his character would have raised him much higher in the opinion of mankind if he had cared either for power or applause."—H. W.

"Two strong objections against the old bill came out, which called loudly for reconsideration. Lord Mansfield had expressed doubts on the clandestine marriages in Scotland, and had advised some persons married there, to be married again legally. The other was still more crying. A young man could marry, complying with the other forms, by swearing he was of age. Should it come out, twenty years afterwards, that he had sworn falsely, whether by design or by ignorance, the marriage would be null, and his children irretrievably bastards."—H. W.

May 18. "Charles Fox's Marriage Bill, on which he had given himself no trouble, having taken away all restraints except the single one of a register, was thrown out, without a debate, by 93 to 34. He arrived from Newmarket just as his bill was rejected."—H. W.

December. "The year, and the first part of the session of Parliament, ended with a new disposition of places, arranged solely to make room for Charles Fox at the Treasury. Lord Edgecombe, one of the vice-treasurers of Ireland, was made to give up that opulent post, and take the vacant place of Captain of the Band of Pensioners, with a salary to make up his loss.—Jenkinson, Lord Bute's creature and one of the secret junto, succeeded as vice-treasurer, and Charles Fox replaced Jenkinson at the Board of Treasury."—H. W.

The events and state of parties in 1772, as well as the situation in which Mr. Fox was placed, both in his private and public capacity, ought to be duly weighed by his biographer, in tracing the origin and growth of his political principles. His father, under whose auspices he had originally been brought into Parliament, was sinking fast under disease and depression of spirits. He was consequently less exposed to the political impressions which his father would have inculcated in him, than during the first and second year of his parliamentary life. Even if that had not been so, his father, though never inclined to opposition, still less to the individuals who then composed it, was far from satisfied either with the public or private conduct of the ministers or of the King. Many of the Bedford party had recovered influence and power, and even high office; and for none of that party (Lord Sandwich excepted) had Lord Holland any remaining feelings of kindness or good-will. Horace Walpole would persuade us that he was so chagrined at being refused his earldom, that he instigated his son to resign. I do not believe it, but I have little doubt that he was discontented at what he considered (and, I believe, was) a breach of promise; and that his conversation on passing events, and on those who were in a situation to influence them, including the King, was ill adapted to inculcate on a young and generous mind any very great attachment to their cause or their persons; so that, had Mr. Fox continued to receive his political impressions under the paternal roof, he would not have been altogether unprepared to admit principles hostile to their system, especially if, in pursuance of it, they should stumble on some measure of a novel nature, and involving in it questions to which neither he nor his connections had been previously pledged. The interest on the Middlesex election, and on the whole of Wilkes's conduct and fortunes, was in some little degree subsiding. As chance would have it, a measure liable to many objections, which his father had urged with peculiar energy and with great success at the most brilliant period of his life, and which were congenial to the temper and character of Mr. Fox, was espoused by the ministers, or forced

upon them by the King—viz., the Royal Marriage Act. Secret family reasons had swayed Lord Holland in resisting so vehemently as he did the Marriage Act of Lord Hardwicke's invention in 1753. But recollections yet more recent, and not unconnected with their family, must have made Lord Holland, as well as Mr. Fox, averse to the principle of throwing legal obstacles in the way of all intermarriages between the royal family and subjects.

The share this famous measure of the Royal Marriage Bill had in determining him to resign has been recorded in the extracts from Walpole, and his own letter to Lord Ossory; and the share his conduct in that respect, as well as other passages of his life about this time, had in making the King on the throne his personal enemy, though less susceptible of proof, may, without any want of charity, be reasonably conjectured. It must, indeed, be acknowledged, that Mr. Fox's resignation was not upon any broad principle of public policy, and it is nearly as clear that neither the discontents he felt, nor the disapprobation which he avowed of that particular measure, were intended as a prelude to active opposition to the Government, and still less as a step towards connections with those who opposed them. Mr. Fox would at that time have shrunk from such a consequence. He would almost have considered such an interpretation of his conduct as an aspersion; but yet the spirited act of resignation, combined with an eager and able resistance to a measure supported by the Court, must have loosened very sensibly those shackles in which his giant limbs had been originally confined. He abstained, indeed, from all party connection with opposition, and he was shortly restored to office; but he had, in the mean time, braced his mind to the independent exercise of his faculties, and he had contracted much personal friendship with many (and with Burke in particular), who were capable and desirous of exciting him to a more elevated and glorious use of his mighty powers, than the mere view of advancement in place would have suggested. This year of exclusion from office, no doubt, laid the seeds of those principles which were afterwards brought into action; as it undoubtedly did of many friendships and connections with

persons with whom it was afterwards his fate to co-operate. The consequences of his exclusion from office on his private habits were not equally happy. He indulged more than ever in his passion for play, and as this and the ensuing years are the period of his great losses, I shall insert the observations communicated to me in conversation by Lord Egremont, in 1823, on the occurrences of that time. Lord Egremont was convinced, he said, by reflection, aided by his subsequent experience of the world, that there was at that time some unfair confederacy among some of the players, and that the great losers, especially Mr. Fox, were actually duped and cheated—he should, he said, have been torn to pieces, and stoned by the losers themselves, for hinting such a thing at the time, and even now those of them, himself excepted, who survived, would exclaim at such a supposition; but he was nevertheless satisfied that the immoderate, constant, and unparalleled advantages over Charles Fox and other young men were not to be accounted for merely by the difference of passing or holding the box, or the hazard of the dice. He had, indeed, no suspicions (any more than the rest had) at the time, but he had thought it much over since, and he now had.

1773.

[In consequence of his losses at play, imperfectly compensated by his winnings at Newmarket, where he was usually successful, Mr. Fox became involved in pecuniary embarrassments to a great amount, from which, in the succeeding winter of 1773–4, he was in some measure relieved, by his father coming forward and purchasing from his creditors the annuities he had granted them. For the payment of some of these annuities several of his young friends had joined him in security, and the securities being purchased with the annuities by his father, who was a public accountant, they were retained by his agents till his own accounts with Government should be settled. It was not till many years afterwards that they were released; but no money was ever paid upon them by the parties who had contracted the engagements,

the whole of the debts from which he was relieved, amounting to 140,000*l.*, being discharged from Lord Holland's own estate.]

February 23. "Sir William Meredith moved to reconsider the subscription to 39 articles." At the instigation of Archbishop of York and University, "Lord North made a point of throwing out the motion, and earnest request of attendance was sent twice to the Court Militia. Charles Fox supported the question."—H. W.

[In the debates on East India affairs, Mr. Fox seems to have taken a violent part against Lord Clive.] On General Burgoyne's motion of the 21st of May, he described Clive as "the origin of all plunders, the source of all robbery;"[1] [and in a subsequent debate on the 11th June, he and Sir William Meredith] "made such unprovoked philippics against Lord Clive that he quitted the house with anger or shame."—H. W.

"In the summer of this year, a woman, who had been transported, and who, a few years before, had advertised herself as a *sensible woman* who gave advice on all emergencies, for half a guinea, was carried before Justice Fielding by a Quaker, whom she had defrauded of money under the pretence of getting him a place by her interest with Ministers, to whom she pretended to be related. She called herself the Hon. Mrs. Grieve, and gave herself for cousin to Lord North, the Duke of Grafton, and Mrs. Fitzroy. She had bribed Lord North's porter to let her into his house, and as her dupes waited for her in the street, they concluded she had access to the Minister. Before Fielding she behaved with insolence, abused the Quaker, and told him she had disappointed him of the place because he was an immoral man, and had had a child. Her art and address had been so great that she had avoided being culpable of any fraud for which she could be committed to prison, and was dismissed, the Quaker

[1] This seems to have been the opinion of George III. himself, for he says to Lord North on 22d May, 1773, "I own I am amazed that private interest could make so many individuals forget what they owe to their country, and come to a resolution that seems to approve of Lord Clive's rapine."

having only power to sue her at common law for the recovery of his money, and for which suit she was not weak enough to wait when at liberty. But the Quaker's part of the story would not have spread Mrs. Grieve's renown, if a far more improbable dupe had not been caught in her snares. In a word, the famous Charles Fox had been the bubble of this woman, who undoubtedly had uncommon talents and a knowledge of the world. She had persuaded Fox, desperate with his debts, that she could procure for him as a wife a Miss Phipps, with a fortune of 80,000*l.*, who was just arrived from the West Indies. There was such a person coming over, but not with half the fortune, nor known to Mrs. Grieve. With this bait she amused Charles for many months, appointed meetings, and once persuaded him that as Miss Phipps liked a fair man, and as he was remarkably black, that he must powder his eyebrows. Of that intended interview he was disappointed by the imaginary lady's falling ill of what was afterwards pretended to be the smallpox. After he had waited some time, Mrs. Grieve affected to go to see if Miss Phipps was a little better and able to receive her swain; but on opening the door, a servant-maid, who had been posted to wait on the stairs as coming down with the remains of a basin of broth, told Mrs. Grieve that Miss Phipps was not well enough to receive the visit. Had a novice been the prey of these artifices, it would not have been extraordinary, but Charles Fox had been in the world from his childhood, and been treated as a man long before the season. He must have known there could not have been an Hon. Mrs. Grieve, nor such a being as she pretended to be. Indeed, in one stroke she had singular *finesse;* instead of asking him for money, which would have detected her plot at once, she was so artful as to lend him 300*l.*, or thereabouts, and she paid herself by his chariot standing frequently at her door, which served to impose on her more vulgar dupes."[1]—H. W.

[1] I believe the loan from Mrs. Grieve to be a foolish and improbable story. I have heard him say she never got or asked any money from him. The story, with some variations, is introduced in one of Foote's farces.—V. H.

1774.

January 26. On Robert's petition against the Lord Mayor, objected to by Sawbridge, "Charles Fox supported it, and, by Rigby's instigation, abused George Grenville's select committee for hearing elections, which had really restored some credit to Parliament, and which the Court disliked as impartial, and destroying the weight of a majority when petitions were tried there, since a small number would not expose themselves to the odium of injustice as a whole party would. T. Townshend observing that Charles Fox sat near the bar, as his father had used to do when he managed elections, said, the young gentleman seemed to think he had, and wished to recover, an hereditary right of managing elections. Rigby, to court Fox, made a panegyric on Lord Holland, whom he had used very ill, and abused G. Grenville's bill. Townshend, with his usual quickness, replied that had he been the friend of Lord Holland, or G. Grenville (as Rigby had been, and deserted both for interest), he should not have forfeited their friendship."—H. W.

"On the 11th of February, appeared in the 'Public Advertiser' a most daring attack on the Speaker, Sir F. Norton, for partiality in preventing the presentation of a memorial in behalf of one William Tooke, a Norfolk gentleman, oppressed by Mr. De Grey, brother of the Chief Justice, who was soliciting a bill to inclose a common, in which Tooke had property, and to which inclosure Tooke would not give his consent. Tooke set his name to the publication, but it was said to be written by Parson Horne, and contained a representation of the Speaker's injustice, which appeared, however, to have been only slovenly hurry."—H. W.

"The Speaker, as soon as the House met, made his complaint, and said that all he desired was to be acquitted of partiality. The members on whom he called disculpated him, and then Lord North, Rigby, and Charles Fox called for the orders of the day, and the matter had like to have ended there, but Mr. Herbert went up to Lord North, and asked him if he did not mean to

vindicate the dignity of the Speaker and of the House. Lord North, with his usual indolent indecision, replied, he had not determined; he must have time to think of it; but Herbert did not give him time, and moved for vengeance on the printer. This set the House in a flame, and many cried that now was the time to assert the honor of the House against the insolence of the press. Lord North himself took up spirit and spoke well, as he always did when he took his part, and he drew a ridiculous picture of a former transaction, to mortify Sawbridge and the city patriots. He said if they sent for the printer, the Lord Mayor would refuse to obey their order. The magistrate would think it his duty, like one of his predecessors, to be sent to prison, would have the comfort of martyrdom, and would probably meet with the same gratitude from his fellow-citizens as his predecessor had done. Dowdeswell put Lord North in mind that Wilkes might avow himself the author of Tooke's letter, and then what would his lordship do? He remembered, he said, how often the ministers had shrunk from the charge, when it had been necessary to question and encounter Wilkes. Woodfall, the printer, was ordered to attend, and, on the 14th of February, Woodfall appeared at the bar of the House. He declared he had received the offensive paper from Parson Horne, but in the hurry of business had not perused it, only seeing two petitions, concluded the paper related to common business of the House, and submitted himself, hoping allowance would be made for his having exercised his profession for twenty years without having ever offended the House before. This behavior greatly softened the House, and Mr. Herbert moved for his being only committed to the Sergeant-at-Arms; but Charles Fox, prompt to be violent and to disgust, and assuming the minister, moved to commit Woodfall to Newgate, in defiance, he declared, of the city and sheriffs, and was seconded by General Burgoyne; but many others objected to the punishment as too severe, and the courtiers themselves were against extremities, as Herbert, Sir William Meredith, and others, were not for violating the liberty of the press. Lord North at last said the offence was too great to be slightly passed over, but,

wishing to avoid a quarrel with the city magistrates, preferred the Gate-house, which was without their jurisdiction, to Newgate. However, if a precedent of a milder punishment could be found, he would yield to it; if not, must tread in the steps of our ancestors, who had been much more watchful over the privileges of the House than the present generation were; and he indiscreetly owned that the House was got into a scrape, must avoid it if it could, at least ought not to provoke it. A tedious debate ensued, everybody trying to procure unanimity and moderation. At last Dowdeswell pointed out a case in the journals exactly parallel, only stronger, as it extended abuse on both Houses; when Meres, the printer, was committed to the Sergeant-at-Arms. This brought over several to the milder side, and Lord North confessed that the case was in point, and that he must submit to it, if Charles Fox, with whom he had concurred for imprisonment, would let him off, though he had bound him to the stake. But Charles Fox, with the most indecent arrogance, stuck to his point, and declared that he would take the sense of the House, and Lord North was so weak as to vote with him, but they were beaten by 152 to 68, Jenkinson, Dyson, and the very Secretaries of the Treasury voting against the minister. Horne was then ordered to attend, and Jenkinson moved that it might be in custody, but that too was overruled, and he was ordered to attend on the 16th. The court was equally odious for the badness of its designs, and the pusillanimity of its execution. Lord North's conduct was irresolute, Charles Fox's presumptuous, and every step he made added to his unpopularity."—H. W.

The indignation of George III. at this transaction is thus expressed in his correspondence with Lord North :—

February 15. "I am greatly *incensed* at the presumption of Charles Fox in forcing you to vote with him last night, but approve much of your making your friends vote in the majority. Indeed, that young man has so thoroughly cast off every principle of common honor and honesty, that he must become as contemptible as he is odious. I hope you will let him know that you are not insensible of his conduct towards you."

"Charles Fox being asked the next day at the club at Almack's whether Lord North had not turned him out, said aloud, 'No; but if he does, I will write a letter to congratulate and tell him that, if he had always acted with the same spirit, I should not have differed with him yesterday.'"—H. W.

February 16. A complaint was made to the House of a letter printed in the "Public Advertiser," and reprinted in the "Morning Chronicle." This paper was an "impudent invective on the Revolution. Indeed, the printers of newspapers seemed to be trying whether they could not provoke the legislature to persecute them. The 'Morning Post' had for a twelvemonth been the grossest vehicle of all manner of scandal." "It was Charles Fox who made the complaint." "T. Townshend took the occasion of teasing and flinging in Lord North's teeth the pensions bestowed by the King on those notorious Jacobites, Dr. Johnson[1] and Dr. Shebbeare."—H. W.

On February the 19th, after Horne Tooke had embarrassed Lord North by surrendering himself contrary to all expectation, appearing at the bar, and conducting himself with great temper and ability there, a debate ensued in which "Charles Fox, struck with Lord North's insufficient behavior, and impatient to aggrandize himself at his expense, cautioned the House, the next time they should be concerned in such a business, not to ascribe any particular merit to a printer in giving up his author, and he rudely blamed Lord North for his imprudence in promising Woodfall indemnity for betraying Horne; he thought printers more culpable than authors, and that the chief punishment ought

[1] I think I have heard that Dr. Johnson happened to be in the gallery that day, and was much gratified by Mr. Fox's reply to Mr. T. Townshend in which he approved of the pension to Johnson, and without being aware of his presence, spoke with great warmth in his praise. Even his subsequent exertions in favor of American liberty never cancelled this obligation. In 1784, in the heat of the Westminster election, Dr. Johnson bade Sir Joshua Reynolds surmount his scruples and vote for Mr. Fox, saying—"I am for the King against Fox, but for Fox against Pitt." —V. H.

to fall on the former. Colonel Barré drew a picture, with much wit, of Lord North, counselled on one hand by Wedderburne, on the other by the youngest man in the house, Charles Fox, both of whom he painted well and extolled ironically: for himself, as he had been a soldier and used to disposing troops, he would advise the noble lord to place the young gentleman on the right, who had recommended to him not to be rash, and the faithful Achates, his learned friend, on the left, and then he would find common sense on one side, and law on the other."—H. W.

February 23. King George III. to Lord North. "I think Mr. Charles Fox would have acted more becoming to you and himself, if he had absented himself from the House; for his conduct is not to be attributed to conscience, but to his aversion to all restraints."

February 24. Charles Fox was dismissed, for his late behavior to Lord North, from being a Lord of the Treasury.—H. W.

Horace Walpole, under the date of the following day, says, speaking of Lord North: "With his usual hurry after indolence he turned out Charles Fox, as a threat to those who might incline to desert, but without effect."

BOOK THE THIRD.

1774.

*In 1774 we may place the real commencement of Mr. Fox's political career. In early life, though surrounded by the political friends of his father, and involved in his resentments, though admired for his quickness in argument, and boldness in discussion, he seems to have given but little earnest attention to the questions of the day. Part of this indifference to grave parliamentary debate may be traced to the violence of his attachment to other and less worthy pursuits; to his passion for gaming, and his indulgence in all the vices of headstrong and unbridled youth.

But part of this indifference may be traced to another cause, and it is necessary for a due understanding of Mr. Fox's character to give in this place an outline of the period in which he had completed his education, and entered the House of Commons. There is no part of our history since the Revolution, which is so little creditable to the Government or to the people, as that which elapsed between the signature of the peace of Paris, and the end of the American War.

The first princes of the house of Hanover who reigned in this country had greatly contributed, by their very ignorance of its manners and its laws, to consolidate its free constitution. Incapable of leading a political party like Charles I., or a religious sect like James II., they naturally sought the aid of the men most able to conduct the business of a complex government, and secure a disputed throne. The affairs of the country had been conducted by Walpole, by Pelham, and by Pitt: men of different

tempers, indeed, but each of them qualified by comprehensive knowledge, by parliamentary experience, and by firmness of character to lead the great Whig party which had founded and had maintained the Hanover succession. The means employed by these three men were various, but all fitted to the end they had in view. Each had observed with scrupulous fidelity the laws which secure personal liberty. At no time was the freedom of the subject more fully enjoyed than in the period from 1720 to 1760. Upon religious questions each was careful not to revive past heats, and without taking off the fetters of the dissenter, not to aggravate the weight of his chains. Upon financial matters and foreign policy, there was a manifest diversity. Walpole, taking the helm of affairs soon after a costly war, and immediately after the South Sea fever, was careful in husbanding the resources of the country, in improving commerce by taking off duties on raw materials, in relieving the subject from taxes, in holding fast to a most scrupulous maintenance of public credit. Pelham had followed in the same course, and while lowering the interest of the public debt, had seen the Three per Cents. rise to par under his administration. Walpole, in order to preserve his system, had paid a minute attention to foreign affairs. But while using the name and influence of England in all continental disputes, he had steadily employed that name and influence for the purpose of preserving or restoring peace. Nor did the eager desires of the Court, or the public clamor of the nation, alter his views, or induce him to swerve from his path.

Mr. Pitt took a different course. He found the nation drifting into war from the negligence or timidity of the Administration to which he succeeded. He did not attempt to ward off hostilities, but framed his measures boldly with a view to cripple his principal enemy.

The part which England took in the Seven Years' War had its origin exclusively in her American quarrel with France. In Europe, her old and natural ally was Austria. It was not her interest to see that ally despoiled of Silesia, and so precarious was her friendship with Prussia, that a few months before the

breaking out of the war, she had been on the point of hostilities with that power on maritime differences.

In America, the interests of England were more nearly concerned. France, holding Louisiana in the south, and Canada in the north, was engaged in forming a line of posts to the west, which should effectually check the growth of the British American colonies. The colonists vigorously attacked the line of forts; Washington drew his sword for the first time against French aggression; and when the American colonists themselves were threatened with a large regular force from France, they appealed to their mother country for safety and for succor.

The English Government, however averse to such a quarrel, did not choose to decline it. Orders were sent to our naval commanders which brought on a conflict.

At the same period a new face had been given to the affairs of Europe. While our relations with Prussia were unfriendly, the ancient alliance of England with the Austrian empire was not entirely dissolved; so that politicians might reasonably speculate on a war of England and Austria against Prussia and France. But these were days of Court intrigue, and a very singular one at this moment altered the face of Europe.

Maria Theresa, with all the pride of Charles V., had seen one of the ancient provinces of her empire conquered by a young rival. She could not reconcile herself to the loss of Silesia, and the diminution of her fame. It occurred to her, or was suggested, that the ancient enemy of Austria might be made an instrument in rebuilding the fortunes of her house. Madame de Pompadour, and the Abbé de Bernis, eagerly caught at a plan which might minister to the ambition of the mistress, and the fortunes of the sycophant. France and Austria were thus united to despoil Prussia of her new conquest; out of these materials Mr. Pitt worked up the fabric of a successful and glorious war. By furnishing to Frederic of Prussia the means of victory at Rosbach, he crippled the power of France in America and on the seas. "I conquered America in Germany," was his justifiable boast at the end of the war.

When that war was concluded, Mr. Pitt was no longer minister. After Lord Bute had held the rudder for an instant, and had shrunk appalled from the roar of the waves, and the dark prospect before him, Mr. Grenville accepted the post of First Lord of the Treasury and Chancellor of the Exchequer. His views were honest, but narrow; he had been unable to comprehend the greatness of Mr. Pitt, and he had served under him in the House of Commons without catching a spark of his genius, or comprehending the vision of his far-seeing eye. To his mind the seventy millions of debt incurred by the war, the lenity allowed in the admission of accounts, the deficiency of contributions from America in a cause that was their own, comprised the whole question before him.

In order to obtain a sufficient revenue for defraying the charge of the debt, he framed fifty-five resolutions imposing stamp-duties on the American colonies, and he devised a system of regulations to defeat the contraband trade carried on between the Americans and foreign countries. From his projected stamp-duties in America he expected to raise a revenue of one hundred thousand pounds! Never were the interests of a great country sacrificed to such paltry and peddling considerations.

The American colonies had never before been subject to direct taxes. The unwise regulations which England, like other countries, had adopted for confining the trade of the colonies to the mother country, had been rendered tolerable by the discreet forbearance with which they were enforced. The colonies resented the attempt to impose internal taxes, and they fretted under the pressure of minute cords which galled and confined their commerce.

In order to estimate fully the want of wisdom shown by Mr. Grenville, some other circumstances must be viewed in connection with his policy.

The North American colonies had been founded by men of the freest spirit, and the most popular notions, both of religion and policy. Some had fled from Laud and Strafford in their own country; others had been impelled by a desire to found a new

state of society in an unfrequented land. The forms of the English Church had never been introduced with success. The outline of our political constitution had been so far copied as to impress the colonists with the belief that all taxes, in order to be legal, must be voted by their own representatives, convened by their Governor, in an assembly of the Commons.

But whatever may have been the freedom of the colonies, their subjection to the mother country had hitherto been maintained by the circumstances of their position. With Canada on the one side, and Louisiana on the other, they felt as keen a rivalry with France as the inhabitants of Southampton or Plymouth. They looked to British fleets and British regiments to protect them from French aggression, and while they felt as Englishmen in our national wars, they contributed liberally as colonists to ward off dangers threatening their own territory and their own trade.

But the very success of England in the late war had weakened the connection. A French army, holding Quebec, commanded by a distinguished general, had disappeared; a British province was in its place. The sagacity of the Marquis of Montcalm had enabled him to predict the consequences of such a change. In the disaster of his country he had drawn consolation from the reflection that the British colonies, relieved from the dread of France, would no longer preserve the same attachment, or practise an equal submission. Some persons in England had made similar predictions. In these new circumstances any provocation to the colonies was doubly dangerous.

The Stamp Act produced the greatest excitement in America. It was reprinted with a death's head prefixed instead of the royal arms, and a name was given to it not inappropriate—"England's folly, and America's bane." At Boston the colors of the shipping were hoisted half-mast high, the church bells were muffled and tolled a funeral knell. More deliberate resistance followed. Proceedings in the courts of justice were suspended that stamps might not be required. Merchants refused to pay debts incurred for English importations. Associations were formed for the ex-

clusive use of colonial manufactures. The collectors, sent over to distribute the stamps, were maltreated, and resigned in a panic. Finally, public offices and private houses were pillaged by a disorderly mob.

These riots took place in August, 1765. When the news reached England, a new ministry was in power. Lord Rockingham was at the head of that ministry; General Conway was their leader in the House of Commons, and Mr. Burke, although then little known, was the confidential adviser of the head of the Government.

The situation was perilous and perplexing. It was impossible to pass unnoticed the flagrant disobedience of America. It was folly to persist in executing an unjust and unwise law.

Parliament met on the 14th of January, 1766. Then occurred that famous debate on the right of Great Britain to tax the colonies, which, in fact, decided the question. Mr. Pitt rose. After speaking of the large proportion of property held by the Commons of England compared with the Crown, the Lords, and the Church, he concluded his argument by saying—"When, therefore, in this House we give and grant, we give and grant what is our own. But in an American tax, what do we do? We, your Majesty's Commons of Great Britain, give and grant to your Majesty—what? Our own property? No! We give and grant to your Majesty the property of your Majesty's Commons of America. It is an absurdity in terms."

Mr. Grenville made a labored reply, and seems to have quoted the precedents of Chester and of Durham.

Mr. Pitt rose again. There was some doubt whether he was in order, but as only part of the Address had been read, and the desire of the House to hear him was great, he was allowed to proceed.

He treated Mr. Grenville with scorn and sarcasm. He proclaimed aloud his sympathy with America. "The gentleman tells us America is obstinate; America is almost in open rebellion. I rejoice that America has resisted. Three millions of people so dead to all the feelings of liberty, as voluntarily to

submit to be slaves, would have been fit instruments to make slaves of the rest. I come not here, armed at all points, with law cases and Acts of Parliament, with the statute-books, doubled down in dog'sears, to defend the cause of liberty; if I had, I myself would have cited the two cases of Chester and of Durham."

He concluded with this advice:—

"Upon the whole, I will beg leave to tell the House what is precisely my opinion. It is that the Stamp Act be repealed, absolutely, totally, and immediately. That the reason for the repeal be assigned, that it was founded on an erroneous principle. At the same time, let the sovereign authority of this country over the colonies be asserted in as strong terms as can be devised, and made to extend to every kind of legislation whatsoever. That we may bind their trade, confine their manufactures, and exercise every power whatsoever, except only that of taking their money from their pockets without their own consent."

Two great questions were at this time pending. The one was the taxation of America; the other was the government of England by party, or by the Court.

It is not true to say, as the vulgar at that time believed, that George III. was governed by Lord Bute, and that he sought to favor the Scotch to the prejudice of the English. But there was truth in the accusation which is brought in Mr. Burke's "Essay on the Causes of the present Discontents." The substance of that accusation may be told very shortly.

After the Revolution of 1688, the two great parties called Whigs and Tories had endeavored to carry into effect their different views of government by means of a majority in the two Houses of Parliament. The personal ascendency of William III., however, had enabled him to employ the party to which he was most inclined at the time, and to give way to his predilections in favor of Tory doctrines, without entirely breaking with the Whigs. Queen Anne for many years governed through the Duke of Marlborough and the Whigs; at the end of her reign by Lord Oxford, Bolingbroke, and the Tories. The popular

favor fluctuated from one of these parties to the other, and the last House of Commons of Queen Anne was more decidedly for High Church and Prerogative than any Parliament which had met since the accession of Charles the Second.

When, on the death of Queen Anne, the Whig party obtained the ascendency, and Dr. Arbuthnot was forced to exclaim, *Fuimus Tories,* Lord Bolingbroke, who had led the Tory party in the House of Commons in the days of their triumph, began, in despair of restoring that victorious position, to promulgate a new system, and to proclaim that "party was the madness of many for the gain of a few."

Among other charges against party it was alleged that the Sovereign was enthralled by it, and was prevented by the intrigues and dictation of a combined faction from advancing merit, and exercising freely his constitutional prerogatives.

There was something very plausible in this doctrine, and when Lord Bute planted it in the tenacious mind of his young pupil, it spread its roots firmly around, and clung to his whole frame, and thought, and conduct. Lord Bute himself fled in affright; his subsequent attempts to govern were coldly viewed by his master, but the lessons he had taught were kept in remembrance and carefully practised.

The proofs of the intention, and rooted desire of George III. to shake off party, are to be found in his own correspondence, confirmed by the testimony of those who took the most active part in the politics of the time.

While the King was on his side laboring to undermine party, Mr. Pitt, whose power and fame had rested on party support, was unhappily working to the same end. He was prompted to this course, partly by disgust at the conduct of Newcastle in the celebrated affair of his proposal for a Spanish war—partly by a wild and irregular ambition which prompted him to imagine that with his uncertain health and ignorance of finance he could direct alone all the affairs of administration.

In this temper he gave his support to the Rockingham Ministry on great measures, but withheld from them the more valuable

aid of his confidence. "Pardon me, gentlemen," he had said with dramatic action: "confidence is a plant of slow growth in an aged bosom." In the same spirit he resisted every offer of Lord Rockingham to join the Ministry, and coldly replied that he would unbosom himself only to the King. The King thus became aware that upon any difference with his Ministry he might look to Mr. Pitt, a man of great popularity and fame, to supply their places.

Yet Lord Rockingham was pursuing, through difficulties and obstructions, a course in which Mr. Pitt ought to have warmly supported him. He was endeavoring to heal the breach with America; to put an end to domestic struggles injurious at once to authority and to liberty; in short, to restore the ascendency of Whig principles by means of a Whig Administration.

Unfortunately the means were not as efficient as the end was noble. Lord Rockingham himself was no orator. When Lord Sandwich, with ready talent and with much bitterness, attacked the Prime Minister in the House of Lords, he made no reply, and Lord Gower, addressing Lord Sandwich, said, "How cruel it is of you to worry the poor dumb animal so!"

In the House of Commons the Ministry were led by General Conway. Horace Walpole, his most intimate friend, has said of Conway: "His heart was so cold that it wanted all the beams of popular applause to kindle it into action." However this may be, his character was not such as to animate his followers. With great integrity of purpose he wavered between principle and interest, according to the wishes of his friends and advisers. Of these friends and advisers the most sagacious was Horace Walpole. Conway had little knowledge of the world; Walpole had a great deal. Conway wished for the public good; Walpole cared for nothing so much as the indulgence of his own hatred and resentments. Thus he often imposed on the simplicity of his friend, and at length induced him to take a part injurious to his country and fatal to his own reputation, in order to keep out of office men who were the objects of Walpole's petty spite or malignant rancor.

The other leader of the Rockingham Ministry in the House of Commons was Dowdeswell, Chancellor of the Exchequer. With considerable knowledge of finance, and with the entire confidence of his friends, Dowdeswell was clumsy and reserved; he had neither the law and sense of Grenville, nor the brilliancy of Townshend, still less had he the purple oratory of Pitt.

Burke, ostensibly the Secretary, and privately the director of Lord Rockingham, was known to the world only as an Irish author, and with his fame as an orator only in the bud, he could have little or no influence in the House of Commons.

The Rockingham Ministry fell, as the Grenville Ministry had fallen, under the displeasure of the Court. General Conway hesitated to support a grant for the King's brothers, which Lord Rockingham had promised the King to introduce. The dissensions of the Cabinet were noised abroad. Lord Sandwich, writing to the Duke of Bedford, observed, that the question of the princes was likely to be as fatal to the existing Ministry as that of the regency had proved to their predecessors. Secret overtures were made to the Duke of Bedford and Mr. Grenville. Mr. Pitt was again appealed to by Lord Rockingham; but he persisted in his former answer, that he would only unbosom himself to the King.

At length the Chancellor (Lord Northington), either convinced that the continuance of so weak a ministry was not for the public advantage, or fearing to be hopelessly swept away in the ebb tide, told the King that, in his opinion, the Administration could not last. The King sent for Mr. Pitt, and intrusted to him the formation of a ministry.

The manner in which Mr. Pitt executed his task has been portrayed in one of Mr. Burke's most successful passages. No lapse of time can weaken the colors of that picture. Indeed, the more we inquire into the details which belong to the formation of Lord Chatham's Ministry, the more we shall be struck with the fidelity of Mr. Burke's painting. One of the most remarkable of his arrangements, and most faithful of important consequences, was that which related to the office of Chancellor of the

Exchequer. It had been held, under the Rockingham Administration, by Mr. Dowdeswell. The office of Paymaster had been held at the same period by Mr. Charles Townshend, a brilliant wit without principles, moral or political, and without industry to fit him for a laborious office. Mr. Pitt conceived the project of obtaining the office of Paymaster for his relative Mr. James Grenville, and for this purpose he offered to Mr. Charles Townshend the office of Chancellor of the Exchequer. Mr. Townshend declared himself very unwilling to exchange an office of 7000*l.* a year for one of 2500*l.*; he even notified his refusal to the King, when Mr. Pitt thought he had accepted; but being at length forced to resign, he became Chancellor of the Exchequer, and took charge of the finances of the country rather than remain out of office. The most extraordinary part of the story is, that Mr. James Grenville, after all, refused the office of Paymaster.

Another part of this strange combination was the new position of Mr. Conway. He had been made Secretary of State by Lord Rockingham, and ought to have resigned when Lord Rockingham, the Duke of Richmond, and Mr. Dowdeswell left office; but Mr. Walpole did not choose that this should be so. He pretended that Mr. Conway's fortune could not bear what Mr. Conway's honor clearly required; so Mr. Conway remained Secretary of State and leader of the House of Commons. But as Mr. Conway was a man of scruples, he soon afterwards stipulated that he should not be bound by the decisions of the cabinet to which he belonged, and that he should be at liberty to oppose in the House of Commons the measures of the Ministry of which he was the organ!

It would seem that confusion could scarcely go beyond this; but, as if to confound still further that confusion, Mr. Pitt, the nominal head of the Ministry, fell ill, and refused to be spoken to on political subjects. With some intervals of large projects, but none of efficient business, he fell into a state of physical and mental debility, and became enveloped in an impenetrable cloud. The King proposed to send the Duke of Grafton to him; he

would not see the colleague of his choice. The King then proposed to pay him a visit himself, and ask his advice; Lord Chatham respectfully declined the honor. Sometimes he was at Hampstead, confined to his room; at one time at the inn at Marlborough, where he dressed up all the waiters in his livery; everywhere he kept himself secluded, and the camp in vain bewailed the absence of Achilles.[1]

It may well be supposed that a ministry so formed and so carried on could only produce embarrassment in the public service, and weakness in Parliament. An arrangement devised for the settlement of the affairs of the East India Company was rejected by that body. The Chancellor of the Exchequer having proposed the renewal of a four-shilling land-tax, was defeated by a union of the Grenvilles and Rockinghams, and the tax reduced to three shillings in the pound.

It was obvious that on this defeat the Ministry ought to have resigned, or to have largely reduced the expenditure. Neither of these courses was taken. Charles Townshend conceived a plan for carrying into effect Mr. Grenville's principle of taxing America, without exposing himself to Mr. Grenville's failure. In an evil hour he proposed a duty on tea, to be levied in American ports. It is obvious that such a tax was as obnoxious as the tax on stamps to Mr. Pitt's celebrated reproach, "We give and grant—what?—our own money?—no; the money of the people of America." Where was Mr. Pitt?—at the head of the Ministry. The tax was also open to all those objections of impolicy which had induced Mr. Conway to move the repeal of the Stamp Act. Where was Mr. Conway?—he was Secretary of State, and the leader of the Ministry in the House of Commons.

This deplorable error was the second source of all the waters of strife which so soon overflowed. Such was the effect of the selfish ambition of Lord Chatham—of the infirm purpose of Mr. Conway. Lord Chatham, indeed, had for the moment an excuse;

[1] Lord Mahon disbelieves the story of dressing up the waiters; Lord Shelburne, however, told the story to his son, the present Lord Lansdowne, and can scarcely have been mistaken.—J. R.

his intellects were darkened by disease. But Mr. Conway had none, and he sheltered himself under a plea as paltry as his act was discreditable. He declared himself at liberty to vote against any measure of which he disapproved, thus weakening all government, and keeping office without dignity or responsibility.

It is impossible in this slight sketch to give an adequate conception of the mischief which ensued. The King, by seeking to elevate prerogative, exposed himself to insulting remonstrances, and repeated indignities. The Ministry, deprived of Lord Chatham and Lord Shelburne, were divided, baffled, and scorned. The sham patriot Wilkes triumphed over the Crown, the Ministry, and the House of Commons, and reigned in the hearts of a people he despised. On the great question of taxing America, the conduct of the Ministry was totally unworthy of respect. It was proposed in the Cabinet by the Duke of Grafton, First Lord of the Treasury, on the 1st of May, 1769, to repeal the duties on tea, paper, glass, and colors imported into America. This proposal was supported by Lord Camden, General Conway, and Lord Granby, but being opposed by the Lord President, Lord Hillsborough, Lord Rochford, Lord North, and Lord Weymouth, the article of tea was left out, and the Prime Minister, defeated by a majority of one, was content to preside over councils he could not guide. But more than this, Lord Hillsborough wrote a circular to the colonies, founded on a minute which was not submitted to the Cabinet, and of which neither the Duke of Grafton nor the Lord Chancellor approved. At one time the Duke of Grafton offered to resign; the Rockinghams, the Bedfords, and the Grenvilles, attempted a concert and produced only a quarrel. At length an Administration was formed, which had at least the merit of having a responsible head.

Frederick Lord North, the eldest son of the Earl of Guildford, represented the old Tory politics of that family. He had boasted in the House of Commons, that he had voted against all popular, and for all unpopular measures. With an ungainly appearance, and awkward manners, he had a vigorous understanding, and though not fond of application, soon became superior to all but

Mr. Grenville in the knowledge of finance. He came into office as a junior Lord of the Treasury, and when he was offered the post of Chancellor of the Exchequer, declined it at first for fear of encountering Mr. Grenville's mature and merciless criticism. There was, however, at this time, an utter dearth of persons to defend, in the leading offices, the policy of the Court. The Rockinghams and the Grenvilles were odious to the King. Mr. Conway was too scrupulous, and voted against the measures of the Ministry to which he belonged. Sir Gilbert Elliot was proscribed by the public as a Scotchman, and seems to have preferred the convenient party called the King's friends—who, as he truly said, were courted by every ministry by turns—to the slippery ascent of political eminence. Lord North, a man of firmness sufficient to defend bad measures, and not too obstinate in urging his own views; of a talent for speaking which gave a decent pretext to a willing majority; and, moreover, an hereditary foe to the great Whig party, was an invaluable accession to the Court. Lord North had many qualities which endeared him to his followers. His good-humor was inexhaustible. When reproached with indolence and love of flattery, he answered that he spent a great part of his time in that house, which was not indolence, and that much of what he heard there could not be called flattery. The language of those days was far less courteous than that to which we are now accustomed. In the vocabulary of opposition he was a profligate, and a wicked Minister, who deserved to have his head brought to the block. Lord North generally disregarded these invectives. But when he saw an occasion of retort, his wit turned the laugh of the House against his opponents. Thus, when Alderman Sawbridge presented a petition from Billingsgate, and accompanied it with much vituperation of the Minister, Lord North began his reply, "I will not deny that the worthy alderman speaks the sentiments, nay the very language of his constituents," &c. He was often asleep in the house, but when an opponent exclaimed, "The noble lord is even now slumbering over the ruin of his country, asleep at a time"—"I wish to God I was," muttered Lord North,

opening his eyes on his discomfited opponent. In private life he was a most affectionate husband and father, beloved by all who surrounded him. Yet he could not suppress his habitual inclination for a joke, even when the occasion seemed least propitious. His son George coming to him one day for money to pay his debts, drew a picture of the straits to which he had been reduced, and finished by saying he had been obliged to sell his favorite mare. "Quite wrong, George," rejoined Lord North, "Equam memento rebus in arduis, servare." It is to be hoped that after this merciless pun he advanced the money.

Lord North's good-humor and readiness gave him great influence with the House of Commons. But he was supported on each side by Thurlow and Wedderburne. Two men of more hardy understandings, or of more pliant consciences, have seldom adorned and desecrated the profession of the law. I here revert to Lord Holland's remarks on the position of Mr. Fox.*

"It has always appeared to me a fortunate circumstance—fortunate for the interests of liberty and truth, and fortunate for the comfort and happiness—perhaps for the character—of Mr. Fox's political life, that he had quarrelled with Lord North before the question of the American war had distinctly arisen. His dismissal from office, and the subsequent loss of his father, gave him an opportunity of exercising an unbiassed and impartial judgment on that great question, and the important principles involved in it. With his gallant spirit in party, he would, no doubt, had he remained in office, have defended in the first instance the conduct of the Government under which he served; and the habit of defending ministers without regard to popularity, as well as the general lessons of political prudence and subserviency to the Court, inculcated by his father, might in some measure have tended to reconcile him to acts of authority, which being unshackled when the great question arose, he could, without inconsistency, resist. It is, however, but just to the first Lord Holland to observe, that his sagacity early foresaw the imprudence of taxing America, and that any deference which Charles Fox might have felt for his father would have led him

to question, or to condemn, rather than to applaud the policy which involved this country in a contest with its colonies. Many traces of this opinion may be discovered in the correspondence of Lord Holland with Mr. Ellis in 1765 and 1766, and in one of his letters he says distinctly—'I am more sorry a good deal for the rebellion of the colonies. But I should date it from the passing of the Stamp Act, not the repeal of it.' I have recorded this at the present period, because it is curious to trace to its origin Mr. Fox's opinion on that great question. And it is worthy of remark that, if in adopting more elevated notions of politics, and more popular motives of action, he deviated from the school in which he had been bred, yet in his preference of a conciliatory to a coercive system of policy—in his abhorrence of unnecessary war, and in his attachment to religious liberty, or at least in his aversion to everything like religious intolerance, hypocrisy, or superstition—he adhered to and enforced the principles which his father had transmitted from Sir Robert Walpole and his school, and instilled into him."—V. II.

*The commencement of the year 1774 was marked by one of those unhappy incidents which tended so greatly to embitter our national contest with America. Benjamin Franklin, a man of science and of letters, having risen from obscurity by his talents, was at this time Deputy Postmaster-General under the Crown for the American colonies, and agent in London for the Assembly of Massachusetts. In both capacities he had become intimately connected with Mr. John Temple, lately Surveyor-General of the Customs, and at this time one of the Commissioners of Customs at Boston. Some letters of Hutchinson, the Governor, and Oliver, the Lieutenant-Governor, of Massachusetts, addressed to Mr. Thomas Whately, Under-Secretary of State, appear to have fallen into the hands of Mr. Temple, and to have been by him communicated to Franklin. The letters were addressed to a private friend, but to a private friend in office, and the matter of them was of a public nature. The violence of the Boston opposition was in these letters treated with severity; doubts

were expressed whether a colony three thousand miles from the parent state should enjoy all the liberty of the parent state. Such letters were sure to kindle a flame in the colony. Regardless at once of such consequences, and of the private character of the letters, Franklin imitated the conduct of the younger Vane, and transmitted the letters, under an injunction of secrecy, to the Speaker of the House of Assembly in Massachusetts. The secrecy which he had not kept himself was not likely to be observed by the leaders of a popular assembly; the letters were divulged; it was resolved by 101 to 5 that they were designed to subvert the constitution; and a petition of the Assembly to the King praying for the removal of Hutchinson and Oliver, was voted, and transmitted to Franklin for presentation. The petition to this effect was by the King's Ministers referred to a Committee of the Privy Council. On the 29th of January, 1774, thirty-five Privy Councillors attended the meeting which had been fixed for the purpose of hearing counsel. Mr. Dunning, afterwards Lord Ashburton, and Mr. Lee, afterwards Lord Rockingham's Solicitor-General, spoke for the petitioners.

On the other side appeared Wedderburne, the Solicitor-General of the Crown. Discarding the merits of the question, he directed his utmost abilities to an invective against Franklin. He denounced the eminent man of letters and of science, as *homo trium literarum*, a cant Roman expression for "fur," a thief. He compared his conduct to that of Zanga in the "Revenge," and exclaimed, "I ask, my Lords, whether the vengeful temper attributed by poetic fiction only to the bloody-minded African, is not surpassed by the coolness and apathy of the wily New Englander?"

It is impossible to justify the conduct of Franklin. The Privy Council might reasonably have dismissed the complaint. But the savage rhetoric of Wedderburne was impudent, scurrilous, and outrageous. Offensive as it was, however, the Lords of the Privy Council applauded it with laughter and noisy assent. They reported that the petition was framed upon "false

and erroneous allegations," and they concluded by declaring it to be "groundless, vexatious, and scandalous."

Such was one of the fatal episodes of the American struggle. Lord North is said not to have joined in the applauding laughter of his colleagues at the intemperate sallies of his Solicitor-General. But when he dismissed Franklin two days afterwards from his post of Deputy-Postmaster, he ought at the same time to have dismissed Wedderburne from his office of Solicitor-General. To refuse all modes of conciliation likely to succeed, was impolitic and absurd, but to prepare the way for it by exciting the passions of the Privy Council, branding with infamy a distinguished citizen, and pointing the finger of scorn at a whole assembly, was flagitious and wicked in the extreme.

The year 1774 may be considered as the epoch of the struggle for independence. Till this year, and even during the course of it, the Americans had retained their affection for England, for its monarchy, its institutions, and its people.

Lord North had, the year before, obtained the easy assent of Parliament to a bill for allowing the East India Company a drawback on tea imported to America, leaving the local duty for imperial purposes to be levied in American ports. The people of Boston took this occasion for a riotous, but at first a clandestine resistance. Persons disguised as Mohawks boarded the tea ships, and threw the chests of tea to the waves.

The answer of Lord North to these outrages consisted of two measures: one, to close the port of Boston, and transfer its establishments to Salem; the other, altering the royal charter of Massachusetts.

In taking this course, Lord North was warmly supported in the closet, and received the sympathy of the country. Yet it is impossible not to reflect that Lord North was the same minister who in 1768 had, by his voice in the Cabinet, prevented the repeal of the tea duty, and the same minister who, in 1778, proposed the repeal of the tea duty, and the abandonment of all taxation by Parliament for imperial purposes. Had he supported that repeal in 1768, he would have prevented the American war; in

1774 he at least would have given a chance to peace; in 1778, after our armies had been defeated, the concession was useless and insufficient.

Such, then, was the period when Mr. Fox was dismissed from office; and it is impossible not to agree with Lord Holland that it was fortunate for his character and reputation that he could oppose the American war, and the measures connected with it, without any deviation from consistency.

Mr. Fox was at this time twenty-five years old; well instructed in poetry, ancient and modern, in history, and in the constitution of his country. One blot alone weakened his influence, absorbed his time, and ruined his fortune. His passion for gaming had at this early age involved him in debt to an enormous amount. His mind was greatly distressed by this burthen, and he was proportionably happy when his father relieved him by paying £140,000 out of his own property. It is stated by Gibbon that on one occasion he sat playing at hazard for twenty-two hours in succession; at that sitting he lost £11,000. Often must he afterwards have said with Mirabeau, "*Ah! que l'immoralité de ma jeunesse a fait de tort à la chose publique!*" In one of the debates on the militia in November, 1775, "Charles Fox saying it was not fit to be trusted in hands who could petition the King for pushing the war against America, Mr. Acland, his cousin, a hot Tory, resented it and said, 'It was fitter in their hands than in those of men who had ruined themselves by the most scandalous vices.' This personality, unprovoked by any, gave offence. Fox replied he confessed his errors, and wished he could atone for them."[1]

In 1774 the breach between the mother country and the colonies was not irreparable. It is true there was a party which sought independence, but that party was yet small, and only gathered strength from the faults of the British Government.—We might disregard the expressions of Franklin, who was not a very sincere or upright man; but Washington, a witness above all exception, writes thus to a captain in the British army, stationed this year at Boston:—

[1] Horace Walpole.

"Although you are taught to believe that the people of Massachusetts are rebellious, setting up for independency, and what not, give me leave, my good friend, to tell you that you are abused, grossly abused. This I advance with a degree of confidence and boldness which may claim your belief, having better opportunities of knowing the real sentiments of the people you are among, from the leaders of them, in opposition to the present measures of administration, than you have from those whose business it is, not to disclose truths, but to misrepresent facts, in order to justify, as much as possible, to the world their own conduct. Give me leave to add, and I think I can announce it as a fact, that it is not the wish or interest of that government, or any other upon this continent, separately or collectively, to set up for independence; but this you may at the same time rely on, that none of them will ever submit to the loss of those valuable rights and privileges which are essential to the happiness of every free state, and without which life, liberty, and property are rendered totally insecure."[1]

The King was, from the commencement to the end, indignant at the resistance of the Americans, and fearful of the dismemberment of his kingdom. At the same time, he would not seek for advice which might prove unpalatable. He sincerely hated the politics of the Whig party, and was provoked at the conduct of Lord Chatham.[2]

[1] Sparks's Life of Washington, vol. i., p. 130.

[2] "In August, 1775, the King writes thus of Lord Chatham: 'The making Lord Chatham's family suffer for the conduct of their father is not in the least agreeable to my sentiments. But I should choose to know him to be totally unable to appear on the public stage before I agree to any offer of that kind, lest it should be wrongly construed as fear of him; and indeed his political conduct the last winter *was so abandoned* that he must, in the eyes of the dispassionate, have totally undone all the merit of his former conduct. As to any gratitude to be expected from him or his family, the whole tenor of their lives has shown them void of that most honorable sentiment. But when decrepitude or death puts an end to him as a trumpet of sedition, I shall make no difficulty in placing the second son's name instead of his father's, and making his pension 3000*l*.'" —*North Papers.*

Lord North, with all his Tory principles and predilections, saw the folly of an obstinate refusal of concessions to America —but unfortunately his concessions were always some years too late; he perceived, likewise, the weakness of his own administration, but he could not withstand the desires and almost entreaties of the King, that he would remain in office.

Lord Chatham, in spite of his own experience, his success in 1759, when he governed with the Whig party, and his failure in 1767, when he attempted to govern without them, still clung, in spite of uncertain health, and the small number of his followers, to the notion of being sole Minister, supported by the King and the country. Thus, in the end of the year 1774, Burke writes to Lord Rockingham: "One cannot help feeling for the unhappy situation in which we stand from our own unhappy divisions. Lord Chatham shows a disposition to come near you, but with those resources (query *reserves*), which he never fails to have, as long as he thinks that the closet door stands ajar to receive him. The least peep into that closet intoxicates him, and will to the end of his life."[1] In this spirit he spoke when he called upon Lord Rockingham in the beginning of January: "Lord Chatham, in point of looks, is very well, and in the extent of our conversation I thought his countenance denoted more than a transient appearance of a tendency to something like cordiality; but our interview lasted near a full hour, and I confess that I was neither much edified, and perhaps had as little reason to be satisfied with some of the ideas and some of the expressions which he dropped. He favored me with his opinion that the Declaratory Bill had been the cause of the revival of all the confusion —that the line of distinction between the *no* right to tax, and the right to restrain their trade, &c., was a most clear proposition. That it might be easily so clearly laid down, that he who runs may read. That to be sure some persons might be prejudiced with different ideas, but those prejudices should be cleared away by reflection," &c.[2] All this, when the real difficulty arose from

[1] Rockingham Memoirs, vol. ii. p. 260.

[2] Lord Rockingham to Edmund Burke. Rockingham Memoirs, vol. ii. p. 261.

the tea duty imposed by Lord Chatham's own Chancellor of the Exchequer, was not a little provoking. Lord Chatham's conduct was in keeping with his language. In a letter to Lord Stanhope of the 19th, having seen Lord Rockingham on the 8th, Lord Chatham says: "Be so good as not to communicate what my intended motion is to any one whatever," &c. On the 30th, he accordingly moved an address, to remove the troops from Boston, without any concert or communication whatever. Lord Rockingham supported the motion, but many of his friends were absent, having had no notice of the nature of Lord Chatham's motion. Thus finished this "appearance of a tendency to something like cordiality."

Yet Lord Chatham's followers, Lord Camden and Lord Shelburne, were men of reputation and talent, although not strong enough to form a government themselves. They remained, after his death, a separate body, able to strengthen or to dissolve the great Whig party.

Lord Rockingham was the acknowledged head of the Whigs. No man, not even excepting Lord Althorp, ever carried into public affairs a purer love of the public welfare. His good sense was never at fault—his judgment clear, his power of expression in writing not inferior to his judgment; his capacity for uniting and guiding men of separate views and jealous tempers generally acknowledged. But he had two deficiencies. First he was no orator, and could seldom be induced to rise in the House of Lords. Secondly, want of health and of natural vigor made him inactive, and inclined to fear rather than hope.

In the House of Commons, Dowdeswell was somewhat heavy; and Burke, whose manner and brogue were strongly against him, was one

> "Who, too deep for his hearers, still went on refining,
> And thought of convincing while they thought of dining;
> Though equal to all things, for all things unfit,
> Too nice for a statesman, too proud for a wit;
> For a patriot too cool, for a drudge disobedient,
> And too fond of the right to pursue the expedient."

The Duke of Richmond, a man of talent and spirit, was apt to despond and to abstain from debates in the House of Lords, from one motive or another. Thus the Opposition was languid, and produced little impression on the nation.

At the general election of 1774, the Court candidates not only prevailed in the counties and small boroughs, but were triumphant in the City of Westminster. The ministerial majority appeared unbroken and undiminished.

* Such was the state of parties when Charles Fox joined first in the debates, and afterwards in the councils of Opposition. He brought his great talents, his surprising vigor, his young and fervent eloquence to the aid of Opposition. We shall see how he promoted, and finally carried to a successful issue, the resistance of the Whig party to the fatal policy of the American War.*—J. R.

In the debate of the 25th of February, on a motion of Sir Edward Astley to render the Grenville bill perpetual, in which Stephen Fox took some part, and T. Townshend in answer laughed at him and his brother, "Mr. Ward spoke for the bill, and then Charles Fox against it, having declared himself, before his rupture with Lord North, as well as [having been] a principal instigator of his opposition. He declared he retained his former opinion; supposed he was peculiarly obstinate; but the House was at last come to surrender its power and privileges. Mr. T. Townshend, he concluded, did not imagine that he, circumstanced as he was, should be able to carry any election either by money or treasury influence. Ministers, said he, looking at Lord North, every day shamefully and basely gave up the rights of the House, and might go further and persecute persons for their opinions; for his part he should be proud to be a *martyr* to that cause."—H. W.[1]

After the debate, George Selwyn said to him, "Charles, for

[1] It may be convenient to state once for all that the following paragraphs, and generally the paragraphs between inverted commas, not otherwise marked, are extracts from Horace Walpole.—J. R.

the future I will fast and eat salt fish on the day you was turned out. You shall be my *Charles the martyr* now. I am tired of the old one, your great-grandfather. His head can never be sewed on again; but as yours can be, I will stick to you."

When Lord North complained of Charles's flippancies to the King, his Majesty, who hated him, had said, "Why don't you turn him out? you may, if you will."

February 26. On the debate on the same subject, "Sir William Dolben, a bigoted Tory, reflected on Charles Fox" [though joining with him in opposition to the bill], observing, "that he talked as if the fate of Cæsar and Rome depended upon his conduct. He was tender in years, but tough in politics, and, if he did not mistake, had already been twice *in*, and twice *out* of place."

March 14. On the bill for removing the Custom House from Boston (the first step in the American war), "Charles Fox, without heat, left himself at liberty to take what part he should please."

March 24. On the same bill, in committee, "Charles Fox declared that he thought the Power of restoring the Port ought to be in the Parliament, not in the Crown, which Phipps denied, as mercy was one of the King's prerogatives. Charles Fox pressed to know what the King's Ministers meant to do further, as this would be but a feeble exertion, worse than none at all; but Lord North, without satisfying him, promised to be consistent without obstinacy."

March 28. On Massachusetts Bill, "Stephen Fox approved vigorous measures, but said the disorders arose neither from Stamp Act nor its repeal, but that all colonies, when they acquire strength, look with a jealous eye to the mother country."

April 12. On Lutterell's motion for censuring the Sheriffs. "Nobody seconding Lutterell, the orders of the day would have been called for, but after another pause, Charles Fox rose, and said Colonel Lutterell should not want a seconder, and then poured out a torrent of invective against Lord North, for his pusillanimity, and what he called his impudent and shameless

silence; Lord North, with great quickness and humor, replied, that he had never before heard of impudent silence—that he had, indeed, seen gentlemen on their legs, whose shameless impudence had shocked all mankind. The laugh of the whole House applied the likeness to the original it was drawn for."

April 19. The two Foxes enumerated among the voters for the repeal of the tea duty.[1]

April 22. On American Jurisdiction Bill, "Charles Fox said, Rigby's politics were very *distinct*—how wise was another question; he would tax the Americans when they were quiet, would tax them *as a boon for their submission*—but we were now fighting for taxation. We might speculatively have a right to tax Ireland. In this country a dispensing power had once been contended for; the moment it came to be exercised, nobody would bear it. It was contrary to fact that the Stamp Act would have passed without opposition. We were irritating the Americans without a power to force them. Whoever would govern a country without its consent, insured resistance."

May 3. On the Massachusetts Bill, "Charles Fox said, Lord George Germaine thought that repealing the tea duty would be giving up the Constitution. Was the tea duty part of the Constitution? The most absurd point of honor that ever was! If taxation be intended, their charters must be annihilated, and [the colonies] could only be maintained by military force."

* Lord Holland, Mr. Fox's father, died on the 1st of July, 1774. Within less than a month afterwards, he lost his mother. His brother Stephen died in the following November, leaving a minor (the late Lord Holland) to inherit his title and estate. Charles Fox succeeded his brother as Clerk of the Pells in Ireland.*—J. R.

In September, Parliament was dissolved.

December 5. On Address. "Charles Fox, Mr. Hartley, the Burkes, and T. Townshend, were very warm on the views and late measures of the Court."

[1] The first vote in conjunction with the Rockingham party given by Mr. Fox.—V. H.

1775.

January 23. "Charles Fox spoke on a petition from merchants trading to America."

January 29. "Charles Fox attacked Lord North violently, who replied that though the gentleman had blamed all his administration, yet he had defended and supported much of it, nor did he know how he had deserved his reproaches. Fox started up and said, he could tell the noble lord how: by every species of falsehood and treachery. Fox was called to order. He rejoined, that he saw the House would hear invectives only on one side."

February 2. On Lord North's motion for carrying on war, "Charles Fox entered into the whole history and argument of the dispute with great force and temper, and made the greatest figure he had done yet, in a speech of an hour and twenty minutes. He said the greatest folly of his life was in having supported Lord North, with which his lordship was always upbraiding him. *He threw some reflections on George Grenville, author of the Stamp Act*, which drew up the latter's son, who had not yet opened, and who defended his father with spirit and decency."

"Before twelve, a division arrived on an amendment proposed by Charles Fox, which tended to leave out all the substance of the Address;" but the original Address "was carried, and it was *a vote for a civil war*, by 304 to 105."

[In writing to Mr. Holroyd, afterwards Lord Sheffield (February 8, 1775), Gibbon, on occasion of this speech, says to him, Fox, "taking the vast compass of the question before us, discovered powers for regular debate, which neither his friends hoped, nor his enemies dreaded." Of this speech of Mr. Fox no memorial has been preserved, except the slight notice of Walpole and the praise of Gibbon.]

February 20. On Lord North's plan of pacification, "Charles Fox moved for the chairman's leaving the chair, and at half an hour after ten at night, the question being put, it was resolved in the negative by 271 to 88."

March 6. On Massachusetts Bill, and Dundas's wish that the inhabitants might be starved, "Charles Fox opposed the engrossment, imputed all the present disturbances to the persisting in taxation, and said the Americans had now discovered that taxation was used as punishment, and that it was bad policy to use power to punish with, nor was it prudent to risk more in the contest than was necessary. Was there a man would say that the Americans had better starve than rebel? If the act should not produce universal acquiescence, he would defy anybody to defend the policy of it. Yet America would not submit. New York only differed in the modes. He believed the Ministers did not like their state of suspense. They wished to drive the colonies into rebellion, and then their way would be plain."

March 23. Charles Fox speaks on Burke's plan for conciliation.

April 5. On the new bill against refractory colonies, Burke and Charles Fox, and many others of the Opposition, were absent.

May 15. Charles Fox spoke for receiving the New York remonstrance.

May 18. Sir G. Savile moved the repeal of Quebec Bill, and was "supported admirably by Charles Fox, but with no success."

October 26. On Address. "The Solicitor-General (Wedderburne) having augured well from ill success, as the late war had begun ill and ended gloriously, Burke took this up to ridicule; but Charles Fox took it up better, and said, 'The late war had not turned to success till the Ministry had been changed (forgetting Lord Chatham had come in and his own father been of the former administration, but with his usual quickness he soon recovered that slip, and said), Lord Hardwicke had been a great lawyer but a wretched politician, and when he gave place to Lord Chatham all had prospered.' 'But,' continued he, rising in energy, 'not Lord Chatham, not the Duke of Marlborough, no, not Alexander, nor Cæsar, had ever conquered so much territory as Lord North had lost, in one campaign.'"

November 16. On another conciliatory motion of Mr. Burke, "Lord Ossory and Richard Fitzpatrick, nephews of Lord Gower,

but won over by Charles Fox, now declared themselves in Opposition. The elder brother spoke sensibly and well, the younger very well. Charles Fox outshone himself, made a very pathetic eulogium on the two brothers, and a very humorous description of the Treasury Bench."

November 27. On Oliver's motion to ascertain advisers of war, "Charles Fox endeavored to prevent a division, but the Ministers knowing their strength forced it on to assure a negative, after Lord North had avowed that he and various ministers had given the advice. Not above ten were for the motion."

[No private letters or memorials of Mr. Fox have been preserved from the period of his dismissal from office to the close of 1775, when he wrote the following letter to Lord Ossory, who was becoming a convert to his opinions on the folly and impolicy of the American war.]

HON. C. J. FOX TO LORD OSSORY.

"LONDON, *Saturday, Nov.* 5, 1775.

"DEAR OSSORY:—

"As you desired me to let you know what is likely to come on next week, I am glad to inform you that, on Friday next, Burke will move to bring in a bill to secure the colonies against Parliamentary taxation, and to repeal the obnoxious laws. I say I am very glad that Burke is to move such a bill, because it will be the fairest test in the world to try who is really for war and who for peace. It is conceived in the most moderate terms imaginable, and states no more than that the Americans have considered themselves as aggrieved by taxation, not that they are actually so; and upon the ground of their having been *in their conception* injured, is founded the repeal of the Tea Act, &c., and a general pardon and indemnity. I am sure, my dear Ossory, if you do think seriously enough of this matter to let your opinion regulate your conduct, it is impossible but you must consider this as the true opportunity of declaring yourself. And, indeed, if party does not blind me very much more than I am aware of,

this is an occasion where a man not over-scrupulous ought to think for himself. It does not need surely the tenth part of your good sense to see how cruel and intolerable a thing it is to sacrifice thousands of lives almost without prospect of advantage.

"Make my best respects to Lady Ossory, and believe me, dear Ossory, yours ever most sincerely,

"C. J. FOX."

[The exhortations of Mr. Fox were not unsuccessful. On the 10th of December, 1775, Lady Holland, sister of Lord Ossory, writes to the Hon. H. E. Fox (afterwards General Fox), then on service in America] "my brothers are both in Opposition."

* The year 1775 had exhibited the Ministry in all its weakness, and the Opposition in all its inutility. While on the side of Government the most culpable improvidence hastened the loss of America, on the side of the Opposition the most brilliant talents and the most prophetic wisdom failed to save a shred of authority, or to avert for a day the most dire calamities. Folly paralyzed the Ministry; discord shattered the Opposition. Thus Sir G. Savile and the Duke of Richmond both wrote in the most desponding tone to Lord Rockingham. The former says, "I am sure we tend, by all we can do, only to make the driving more furious. It is a child pulling against a runaway horse; let him alone, and he will stop the sooner," &c. Thus the Duke of Richmond on a particular motion, "I confess that I feel very languid about this American business. The only thing that can restore common sense to this country is feeling the dreadful consequences which must soon follow such diabolical measures."[1]—*J. R.

1776.

JANUARY. "What little life there was [in Opposition] existed in the Duke of Richmond and Charles Fox. The latter

[1] Rockingham Papers, vol. ii. pp. 284–290.

bustled, tried to animate both the Duke and the Marquis, conferred with Lord Shelburne, but neither abandoned his gaming nor rakish life. He was seldom in bed before five in the morning, nor out of it before two at noon."

February 20. "Charles Fox made a motion in the House of Commons for inquiring into the ill-success of the King's arms in America, and laid open all the boasts, blunders, and disgraces of the Administration; as Barré did still more severely, with much irony on Lord G. Germaine, whom he called the Pitt of the day. Lord Ossory and Richard Fitzpatrick, nephews of Lord Gower, but intimately connected with Charles Fox, both spoke well."

March 11. "Charles Fox made a panegyric on General Montgomery (who had borne a most excellent character), and reproached the Administration with having lost by ill-treatment so amiable a man—a man distinguished by the friendship and esteem of General Wolfe."

May 22. Charles Fox among the speakers in favor of a motion of General Conway's for the instructions to Howe.

[The following letters, written on intelligence of some successes obtained in Canada, show Mr. Fox's concert with Lord Rockingham, and also that Mr. Fox had gained the concurrence of Lord Ossory, not only in his views of the impolicy of the war, but of the injurious consequences to the liberties of England that must attend its successes]:—

HON. C. J. FOX TO LORD OSSORY.

"*June* 24, 1776.

* * * * * * *

"It will give the tools and Tories here such spirits as to make them insufferable. As to myself, you know little matters do not oppress me much. I am still convinced the Americans will finally succeed, whether by victories or defeats; and if they do not, I am sure, as the men say in Braganza, that it will check all future enterprise to such a degree as to give the completest triumph to

Toryism that it ever had. I suppose the particulars of this news will be in to-morrow's Gazette, to which I refer you for them. Whatever happens, for God's sake let us all resolve to stick by them as handsomely (or more so) in their adversity as we have done in their glory, and still maintain the Whig cause, however discredited by defeats, to be the only true principle for this country. The *serieux* of this letter may probably make you think me more dispirited than I am by this news. I am really not much so myself; but I see such strange dispositions in others to despond on every trifling disadvantage that I fear the effect it may have upon them. My compliments to Lady Ossory. Adieu, my dear Ossory.

"Yours ever affectionately,
"C. J. FOX."

HON. C. J. FOX TO LORD OSSORY.

"White's, *September* 24, 1776.

"Dear Ossory:—

"You will see by the 'Evening Post' that, though there is no news of a battle, there is news of consequence enough. Washington, who is not thought a rash man, must surely think himself pretty secure in New York, when he makes the direction of a letter the plea for not receiving what he must certainly guess to be an offer of a cessation of hostilities. The word 'unlimited' is an odd word, but I suppose nothing more is meant by it than that Lord Howe's powers were not limited to military affairs. I think the publishing of the declaration he has published the weakest thing, if possible, that has yet been done; because that appearing alone, it must be understood in America that pardon is the only boon offered, and that King and Parliament do not mean to offer any further terms. You see that the Congress have taken advantage of this by saying that *the people of America may see by this*, &c. If it were possible to add to the folly of the substance of this declaration, I think the wording of it would. What do you think of the promise of *duly considering* those who

promote peace? The effect must be that if anybody should attempt to hold the least peaceable language, that person will be immediately considered as *bribed* by Lord Howe's declaration, and, in Lord Clarendon's phrase, respected accordingly. What I lay the principal stress on in all this news is, 1, that the Congress and Washington seem to be in perfect unison; and, 2, that both of them, being fully apprised of the force prepared against them, do not think it even worth while to amuse the enemy by hopes of a treaty, but are ready to receive them with all their force rather than give way on the smallest point. If they have common sense, and surely that is not to be doubted, they must be pretty secure at New York in their opinions; and why they should not judge as well as anybody else, I am sure I cannot tell. Is it not charming, their setting about their new government so deliberately in the face, as it were, of the enemy? and if George III. should have for a moment the vanity to compare himself to Patrick Henry, how humiliated he must be! Adieu. Compliments to Lord Ossory. I am afraid I cannot be at Ampthill before Newmarket.

"Yours affectionately,
"C. J. FOX."

HONORABLE CHARLES JAMES FOX TO THE MARQUIS OF ROCKINGHAM.

"NEWMARKET, *October* 13, 1776.

"MY DEAR LORD:—

"Though I am far from being dismayed by the terrible news from Long Island, I cannot help thinking that it ought, with what will naturally follow it, to have a considerable influence upon our councils, and that we ought, under the present circumstances, to pursue a conduct somewhat different from that which was projected at Wentworth. A secession at present would be considered as a running away from the conquerors, and we should be thought to give up a cause which we think no longer tenable. But the more I am convinced that a secession is become improper, the

clearer I am that it is become still more necessary than ever to produce some manifesto, petition, or public instrument, upon the present situation of affairs; either to exhort his Majesty to make the proper use of his victory, by seizing this opportunity of making advantageous offers of accommodation, or to express openly and fairly to him the well-grounded apprehensions every man must entertain from the power of the Crown, in case his Majesty should be able to subdue the American continent by the force of his arms. Above all, my dear Lord, I hope that it will be a point of honor among us all to support the American pretensions in adversity as much as we did in their prosperity, and that we shall never desert those who have acted *unsuccessfully* upon Whig principles, while we continue to profess our admiration of those who succeeded in the same principles in the year 1688. Whatever is intended, I am sure it is not necessary for me to press upon your Lordship the expediency of your using every means possible to have a great attendance on the 31st, in order to which, no time must be lost in making application to the members through the properest channels. If your Lordship should think it worth while to write a line in answer to this, I should be glad to know when you will be in town, as likewise whether there is anything in which I can be serviceable. Believe me, my dear Lord, the expectation of your Lordship and all your friends must in a great measure depend upon the part you act at this critical juncture. I am sure you are a person whom one need not advise to take a *firm* one; but I am so clear that firmness in Whig principles is become more necessary than ever that I cannot help conjuring you, over and over again, to consider the importance of this crisis. In regard to myself, I dare hope that professions are unnecessary, and I will therefore trouble your Lordship no further than to assure you that I am resolved, in the present situation of affairs, to adhere still more, if possible, than I have done to those principles of government which we have always recommended with respect to America, and to maintain that if America should be at our feet (which God forbid!), we

ought to give them as good terms (at least) as those offered in Burke's propositions.

"I am, my dear Lord,

"Yours, etc.,

"C. J. FOX."

"P. S. I shall be here, or near it, till I hear from you."[1]

October 31. On Address. "Charles Fox answered Lord G. Germaine in one of his finest and most animated orations, and with severity to the answered person. He made Lord North's conciliatory proposition be read, which, he said, his Lordship seemed to have forgotten, and he declared he thought it better to abandon America than attempt to conquer it. Mr. Gibbon, author of the Roman History, a very good judge, and being on the Court side, an impartial one, told me he never heard a more masterly speech than Fox's in his life; and he said he observed Thurlow and Wedderburne, the Attorney and Solicitor-General, complimenting which should answer it, and at last both declining it."

[On the 15th of November, 1776, the King writes to Lord North]: "I had learnt from Lord Weymouth that Charles Fox had declared at Arthur's, last night, that he should attend the House this day, and then set off for Paris, and not return till after the recess. Bring as much forward before the recess as you can, as real business is never so well considered as when the attention of the House is not taken up by noisy declamation."[2]

[The plan thus announced at Arthur's was carried into execution. In the December following, we find Mr. Fox, with his friend Mr. Fitzpatrick, established at Paris, where they passed the recess amusing themselves and losing their money at play. Mr. Fox appears to have lived much in the society of Madame du Deffand, but the impression he made on that celebrated lady was on the whole far from favorable. "Je l'ai beaucoup vu,"

[1] Rockingham Memoirs, vol. ii. p. 297.

[2] MS. Correspondence with Lord North.

says she in a letter to Horace Walpole,[1] "mais nous nous sommes contrariés; nos façons de penser sont très differentes. Il a beaucoup d'esprit, j'en conviens; mais c'est un genre d'esprit denué de tout espèce de bons sens;" and in continuation of the same letter she adds, "Le Fox compte vous voir. Dites lui que je vous ai écrit beaucoup de bien de lui. En effet j'en pense à de certains égards, il n'a pas un mauvais cœur, mais il n'a nul espèce de principes, et il regarde avec pitié tous ceux qui en ont; je ne comprends pas quels sont ses projets pour l'avenir, il ne s'embarasse pas du lendemain. La plus extrême pauvreté, l'impossibilité de payer ses dettes, tout cela ne lui fait rien. Le Fitzpatrick paroîtroit plus raisonnable, mais le Fox assure qu'il est encore plus indifferent que lui sur ces deux articles; cette étrange sécurité les élève à ce qu'ils croient, audessus de tous les hommes. Ces deux personnages doivent être bien dangereux pour toute la jeunesse. Ils ont beaucoup joué ici, surtout le Fitzpatrick; il a perdu beaucoup." In another passage, she says of Mr. Fox, "Il me semble qu'il est toujours dans une sorte d'ivresse;" and concludes by saying, "Il joint à beaucoup d'esprit, de la bonté, de la verité, mais cela n'empeche pas qu'il ne soit détestable." In another passage, speaking of Fox, she says, "Je lui aurai paru une platte moraliste, et lui il m'a paru un sublime extravagant."]

* The year 1776 was the year of the Declaration of American Independence. Great Britain appears to have used every means most fitted to bring about this result: vacillation in council, harshness in language, feebleness in execution, disregard of American sympathies and affections, were all employed to alienate our colonies. In the present year, Hessian troops had been hired to inflict on American farmers and tradesmen the horrors of war. The American provinces were treated with military license; houses burnt, property plundered, friends estranged, enemies exasperated. To complete the horrors of civil war, Indian savages were excited to hostilities against the King's subjects.

But the power which was thus made an object of hatred was

[1] 13 Janvier, 1777.

made also one of contempt. General Howe was forced to evacuate Boston, spiking his cannon, and abandoning his stores, for want of adequate reinforcements. The spirits of the Americans were raised to the highest pitch, while their passions were inflamed to the most intense resentment.

Thus encouraged, and thus excited, the Congress, on the 4th of July, agreed to the memorable Declaration of Independence. The wrongs inflicted or threatened by George III. were enumerated; and in conclusion it was declared—

"We, therefore, the representatives of the United States of America, in General Congress assembled, appealing to the Supreme Judge of the World for the rectitude of our intentions, do, in the name, and by the authority of the good people of these colonies, solemnly publish and declare that these United Colonies are, and of right ought to be, *Free and Independent States.*"

This declaration was the cry of an infant State. It has since grown to manhood; it has now a giant's strength.

Whether it would have been possible to maintain the colonies in subjection to the Crown of England for a much longer period, may well be doubted. Trade regulated at Westminster could hardly be consistent with wealth and freedom at New York. Sources of dispute might have arisen, even if the plan of Lord Rockingham, or that of Lord Chatham, had been fully adopted. But it was the peculiar infelicity of George III. and Lord North that they turned to gall all those feelings of filial piety which had so long filled the breasts of the Americans.

The Declaration of Independence has one singular defect in it, but which only proves the lingering affection which the Americans still retained for the mother country.

As Mr. Jefferson originally drew the Declaration of Independence, he charged the acts of which the Americans complained, in the first place to the King, but secondly to the people of Great Britain. Thus, he said of them, that "when occasions have been given them, by the regular course of their laws, of removing from their councils the disturbers of our harmony, they have, by their free election, re-established them in power." Then, again, he

proposed to say, "These facts have given the last stab to agonizing affection, and manly spirit bids us to renounce for ever these unfeeling brethren. We must endeavor to forget our former love for them, and hold them, as we hold the rest of mankind, enemies in war, in peace friends. We might have been a free and a great people together; but a communication of grandeur and of freedom, it seems, is below their dignity. *Be it so, since they will have it.* The road to happiness and glory is open to us too. We will tread it apart from them," &c.

These expressions, though still in the tone of wounded affection, rather than of willing enmity, were too hostile to the English people to please the representatives of America. "The pusillanimous idea that we had friends in England worth keeping terms with," says Mr. Jefferson, "still haunted the minds of many."[1] More probably the fond regard long entertained for the mother country still vibrated in the hearts of most of those who now threw off her authority.

Be that as it may, the omission of these passages warped the truth of this memorable Declaration. George III. appears in it as a single and despotic tyrant; as Philip II. must have appeared to the people of the Netherlands. The fact was that the Sovereign and his people were alike prejudiced, angry, and wilful.*—J. R.

1777.

* The year 1777 may be said to have decided in favor of our colonies the question of American independence, which had been so boldly put forth by them in the preceding year.

The march of Burgoyne from Canada, with a view to break the line of provincial defence, and insulate the New England States, ended in his surrender at Saratoga. It was not disgraceful to the British arms that 3500 soldiers, pushed forward into a hostile country without aid from the front or retreat in their rear, should capitulate to 15,000 Americans, aided by numerous de-

[1] Memoirs of Thomas Jefferson, vol. i.

tachments, who occupied the surrounding country. But the failure of the enterprise showed the folly of the contest; it was impossible to occupy with an army the vast extent of the colonial states, and it was evident that no willing submission could be expected. The naval means of Great Britain could only hold the fringe of the coast, and that not completely or entirely.

In the same year Lord Chatham made one more effort to retain the dependency of the transatlantic provinces by affection. He owned he could no longer hope success from the terms he had formerly proposed, and he now, therefore, moved an address to the Crown, urging compliance with all the demands of America, with the exception of independence. His motion, though supported by the Whigs, was rejected by a large majority.

The success of America was owing, next to the errors of her adversaries, to the conduct and character of General Washington. In him were united the purity of the most disinterested patriotism with all the energy of the most stirring ambition; the utmost reluctance to engage in the contest, with the firmest will never to abandon it when begun; the most intrepid devotion of his life and his fame in hazardous attacks, with the calmest judgment in all matters political and military. The dissensions of Congress, the envy of rivals, the apathy of his troops, the calumnies of his enemies, neither excited him to rashness, nor stopped him in his career.*—J. R.

February. Walpole having information that a bill to suspend the Habeas Corpus throughout America was intended by Ministers, had communicated this intelligence to Charles Fox and others, who he says would not believe it till the bill was actually brought into Parliament.—H. W.

The Rockingham party being at that time in secession, "Lord Rockingham held a meeting to consider whether they should return and oppose, and they had great divisions. Lord Rockingham, the Cavendishes, and Burke adhered to their stupid retreat; but Charles Fox would not, and even Sir G. Savile, though more attached to Lord Rockingham, was so honest as to attend the House on the third reading, and spoke against the bill."

Charles Fox opposed the second reading. "Lord North ridiculed him, and said he should not have known the Opposition was so insignificant if the gentleman had not owned it. It was voted by 195 to 43."

13th. Lord North accepted a clause in the Habeas Corpus Bill proposed by Dunning, "to the indignation of Rigby," says H. Walpole, "and all the violent." "Charles Fox, in an admirable speech, complimented Lord North on his candor and universal benevolence; said he should consider him as the head of the seceders, and their guardian against the violence of his coadjutors. But Lord North's conduct that day had been so desultory and uncertain, that the courtiers interpreted the panegyric as a sarcasm."

"Wedderburne, whom Charles Fox had treated severely, recovered himself, and made one of his best speeches, that hurt Fox much, drawing a parallel between him and Wilkes, and ridiculing universal benevolence (to which he unfairly added the word equal) and said all great writers had given up the idea of equal universal benevolence."

April 16. On Lord J. Cavendish's motion for inquiring into accounts relating to the King's debts, "Charles Fox made a speech that even the courtiers allowed to be one of his finest orations, but then they commended it because it was remarkably decent and respectful to the King—218 to 114."

April 18. "On the Report, Lord North made a good speech, in which he attempted to answer Fox's of the preceding day—a proof of the excellence of the latter, as Lord North had taken two days to answer it. As Charles Fox had defended the Duke of Grafton's conduct, Lord North was very severe on it."

"Charles Fox asked Lord North if he thought the addition of 100,000*l.* would be sufficient without coming for more. Lord North said he thought it would till the Prince of Wales should be grown up. Charles asked if he would pledge himself. Rigby said Lord North was not bound to answer questions from individuals; whenever it had been done, an ill use had been made of

it. Perhaps Lord North might not be in power when the Prince shall be married; how then can he pledge himself?"

May 9. Rigby alluded with disapprobation to the Speaker's famous speech at the bar of the House of Lords, in which he said the grants were great beyond example, great beyond his Majesty's highest wants. "The Speaker, Norton (after the debate), complained of Rigby's attack, and Charles Fox proposed words in justification of the speaker, which were agreed to without a division."

May 23. "A job of the Ministers in the African Company was severely treated by Charles Fox." "The Ministers were forced to abandon the African job, which had been countenanced by Board of Trade."

In the summer of 1777, Mr. Fox visited Ireland with Lord John Townshend. It was a mere party of pleasure, settled between them when riding out at Chatsworth. They took their horses over, and accompanied Conolly and Lady Louisa on an excursion to the Lakes of Killarney. Mr. Fox made acquaintance with, and indeed contracted a sincere friendship for Mr. Grattan, whom he met at Lord Charlemont's. Irish local politics were little discussed, and had not at that time much attraction. While at Dublin the two strangers were much caressed and attended to, and were constantly invited to dinners, where there was much conversation and a prodigious quantity of wine. A wild and hazardous freak of Lord John Townshend and Mr. Fox made a great noise, and, what seems strange, raised their reputations in Ireland, where everything that is rash is considered as a proof of spirit. They bathed in the Devil's Punch Bowl, and fortunately escaped from all the consequences to be apprehended from its extreme coldness.—V. H.

Mr. Fox had now resolved to connect himself avowedly with the Rockingham party. He told Lord John Townshend so at Chatsworth. Mr. Burke, in a letter directed to him in Ireland, urges him to adopt that measure; but his exhortations were superfluous. He was already resolved to do so, though he did not in full form till 1778, or even 1779.—V. H.

[Parliament met on the 18th of November, 1777.] The following extract from a letter of Lord Ossory to his brother, Richard Fitzpatrick, then in America, gives an account of the first day's debate (20th Nov.). It is dated Ampthill, 27th Nov. 1777.

"The most material event I have to mention to you is the meeting of Parliament last week. You will see, by the speech and address, that we have so much pleasure and delight in the American war, that we pledge ourselves to support the prosecution of it, notwithstanding the total ignorance we are in respecting the situation of our armies. There was scarce the difference of a vote in either House. In ours, for two days' debate, I never remember such a superiority in point of speaking, argument, reason, everything but numbers. Our friend exceeded himself, and pronounced a grand philippic against the American secretary, whom he held up as the author of all the mischief. He went rather too far, and the House did not go along with him. The epithets he bestowed were—'*That inauspicious and ill-omened character, whose arrogance and presumption, whose ignorance and inability*'—in short, he quite *terrassé'd* him; so much that I think he will never exhibit himself to that House as its leader, so long as the other sits in it. The philippic did not seem unacceptable to the other party in administration, though the *Premier* declared the acquisition of the secretary was a great credit to them. Burke, Sir G. Savile, and General Conway were all excellent in their different ways. Old Chatham was in high spirits; the amendment in both Houses was his, and they say parts of his speech were very fine. We wait for news for our (I mean Opposition) proceedings. It is my opinion, and everybody's that has common sense, that we must be totally demolished, as a country, by this folly, obstinacy, and insensibility."

[Some further particulars of what passed in the Commons are given by Walpole]—"The only brilliant part of the debate was a bitter philippic on Lord G. Germaine, by Charles Fox, in his highest manner. He called him an ill-omened and inauspicious character, and, besides blaming the choice of a man pronounced unfit to serve the Crown, dwelt on his ignorance and incapacity

for conducting a war. The attack was by moderate men thought too personal and too severe. It was felt in the deepest manner by Lord George, who rose in the utmost consternation, and made the poorest figure. He said the man in the world who he chose should abuse him had done so. General Conway said the next day he was exactly of a contrary opinion. Lord North handsomely defended Lord George, and said he was glad Fox had abandoned him, an old hulk, to attack a man-of-war; but afterwards he perhaps hurt Lord George as much as Fox had done, for the latter coming up to the Treasury benches, Lord North said, in Lord George's hearing, 'Charles, I am glad you did not fall on me to-day, for you was in full feather.'"

November 21. On a motion of General Conway's, on the Report, "Wedderburne blamed Charles Fox's preceding philippic, and pretended to lay down rules for invectives."

HON. C. J. FOX TO LORD OSSORY.

"London, *November* 29, 1777.

"Dear Ossory:—

"It is now settled that the Duke of Richmond, in the House of Lords, and I in the Commons, are next Tuesday to move for a state of the nation. We do not propose to go into that state before Christmas, and I take it for granted, the Ministry will give us our motion; but we shall move for many papers, some of which will probably occasion some debate. Lord Chatham approves, and will, I believe, be down. We have not divided since you went, but we think we have been very victorious in debate. Whether we shall divide on Tuesday will, I suppose, a good deal depend on our attendance. Upon this state of the thing, you will judge whether it is worth your while to come up. There is no news yet of any sort, and we seem almost to give up the thoughts of any. People in general seem to be very much tired of the business, and though we have not yet got one vote this year, I cannot help thinking we are grown considerably stronger in public opinion, for in all the debates we have had, the Minis-

ters have said nothing to give people hopes for the future, and little in justification of the past. I am clear the *opinion* of the majority of the House is now with us. I cannot help flattering myself that *opinions* will, in the long run, have their influence on *votes*. At all events we ought to try, for though what we do may have no immediate effect, yet it may have some next year, unless some unexpectedly favorable events should make people once more as mad and as sanguine as they were last year. Pray make my best respects to Lady Ossory."

[So far as the independence of America was concerned, the surrender of Burgoyne's army was decisive. The impression which the first intelligence of this disaster made on some even of the stanchest supporters of the war appears in the following letter of Mr. Crawford to Lord Ossory:—]

MR. CRAWFORD TO LORD OSSORY.

"*December* 4, 1777.

"My dear Lord:—

"The papers of to-day contain a full account of all we know of the unfortunate fate of Burgoyne's army. I had not time to inform you of it last night. I passed the whole day in the House of Commons, and was too much interested to go up stairs to write a few lines to you.

"Charles made a motion to have the instructions given to General Burgoyne relative to the Canada expedition, and that part of Sir W. Howe's instructions relative to his co-operation with Burgoyne laid before the House. Nobody could, or attempted to, make the least objection to this motion, further than that it was premature, as no authentic account of this unfortunate news was yet arrived. The previous question was put upon it, and passed without a division. But if news does not arrive before the holidays, Charles means to renew his motion, and I should think must be supported in it by many of the friends of Government. It is impossible, I suppose, to receive the news of the

loss of an army, and to refuse to inquire into the causes of such a miscarriage, even though we cannot get at all the information that is necessary. Charles spoke with great violence, but the House for this time went along with him. We were not shocked at his talking of bringing Lord George to a *second* trial, nor were we shocked at being asked if we could patiently continue to submit to see this nation disgraced by him in *every* capacity. There were high words between Wedderburne and Burke, which so offended the latter, that he went out of the House, and I believe intended to challenge Wedderburne, but was prevented by a letter from Wedderburne, and an explanation likewise, which he sent him through Charles. In the midst of Wedderburne's speaking, Burke burst into one of his loud hysterical laughs. Unfortunately at that moment there was a dead silence in the House. Wedderburne, in a very angry tone, said that, if that gentleman did not know manners, *he as an individual* would teach them to him; that he had not the good-will of that gentleman, and did not wish for it; but he was ambitious of having *even his respect*, and would force it from him, &c. This the other construed into a menace. It is impossible to give an account of a conversation of this kind, which depends entirely upon the tone and manner; but I know Lady O. would not have forgiven me if I had not attempted it, and it is for her, and not for you, that I have given this imperfect description of a quarrel, which is very well settled on both sides. Burke was originally in the wrong, because nothing could be more uncivil than his laugh appeared to be, from the accident of the dead silence of the House at that moment."

December 2. "Charles Fox made the same motion for papers in the Commons which the Duke of Richmond made in the Lords. He [Charles Fox] shone eminently again, attacking Lord G. Germaine, whom he compared to Sangrado, who would persist in drawing blood because he had written a book upon bleeding." The Lords granted the papers, the Commons refused them by 178 to 89.

December 3. On the Army, "Charles Fox and Burke pressed

Lord George to know if the capture of Burgoyne and his army was true. He was forced to own he believed it, though he did not know it officially. The Opposition, instead of receiving such a national indignity with serious lamentation, insulted the Ministers so much, that the majority appeared more exasperated and less dejected than on the former days of the session." "Charles Fox went further, and told Lord George that he hoped to see him brought to a second trial, and abused Ministers on their stupidity and ignorance. On Lord George saying he hoped Burgoyne would not be condemned unheard, Fox flamed still more, and charged Lord George with the whole blame of the badness of the plan."

December 4. "There was a short but warm debate on the renewal of the [suspension of the] Habeas Corpus, and Fox charging Thurlow with it as a black act, Thurlow answered him warmly, and asked if, supposing his character a black one, Fox's was a white one."

December 10. On Lord North's giving notice of a plan for treating with the Americans, "Burke and Fox abused him, and told him the Ministers thought of nothing but keeping their places."

December 15. "Burgoyne's account [of his surrender] was in his usual bombast and absurd style; he talked of having *dictated* the terms of his surrender, and lest it should not be published at length in the 'Gazette,' he sent one copy to Lord Derby, and another to Charles Fox."

1778.

* The surrender of Burgoyne's army at Saratoga soon ripened into a formal treaty the negotiations between France and the United Colonies. Franklin and M. Gérard, on the 6th of February, 1778, signed the treaty of peace and commerce at Paris.

Such was another act in this miserable tragedy. The House of Commons was afflicted, gloomy, and silent. The house of Bourbon grasped eagerly at the prospect of recovering the colonies

lost in the Seven Years' War. The Minister begged, in vain, permission to retire.

It is no wonder that these proofs of folly, and the pressure of so many calamities, roused to the highest pitch of indignation the eloquent voices of Chatham, of Fox, and of Burke.*—J. R.

January 22. "Charles Fox moved again for the instructions to Howe and Burgoyne, and falling foul on the many obnoxious measures, compared the present reign to that of James II. Colonel Lutterell flew into a rage, but could not express what he meant, but muttered something of Fox declaring he would talk treason. Lord North, to avoid the charge, owned it had been almost treason."

January 27. "Charles Fox, in an admirable speech, attacked Lord North, on having called himself an unfortunate minister, and proved that all the disgraces had happened by ignorance, blunders, and misconduct—not by misfortune. Lord North answered with some humor; and as Fox had accused him of idleness, and of listening to flatterers, he said he passed a great deal of time in that house, where he could not be idle, and it was plain he was not flattered."

January 29. "Colonel Lutterell complained of a misrepresentation in the newspapers, but in fact it could not be made worse. He had been so absurd, and so furious, that many thought he had been set on by the Ministers to provoke Charles Fox to a duel."[1]

February 2. A motion on state of the nation was made by Charles Fox, "after a speech of two hours and forty minutes, in which he recapitulated the events, history, and misconduct of the war with astonishing memory and method. The Ministers

[1] The *Morning Post*, a paper notoriously paid by the Court, abused Fox on this occasion in the most outrageous terms, and accused him of cowardice in not challenging Lutterell, which it evidently tried to make him do. Even Lutterell was ashamed of such assassinating endeavors, made excuses to Fox, and hoped he did not suspect him of being accessory to so black a design.—H. W.

did not make one word of answer, but most indecently called for the question, when it was rejected by 259 to 165; a surprising minority, that much alarmed the Administration."

HON. C. J. FOX TO MR. FITZPATRICK (THEN IN AMERICA).

"LONDON, *February* 3, 1778.

"MY DEAR RICHARD:—

"Though I have been unpardonably idle about writing to you, yet I suspect that I appear still more so than I deserve; for, by your never mentioning it, I take it for granted you never received a long letter I wrote you from Chatsworth.

"I am more angry with myself than you can conceive for not writing oftener, but I have put it off, as you know I do everything, from day to day, in hopes of having something to tell you worth hearing. I am sure, however, you do not really believe what you say, of your being forgotten by your friends here; if you could really think so with regard to me for one moment, it would make me more unhappy than almost any misfortune you can conceive. You know how very highly I rate friendship among the goods of life, and how highly I rate yours, is, I am sure, needless to say; but I will say no more on the subject, because I am sure you cannot know me so little as to think it possible I should ever change with regard to you, and you are not the sort of person to take a little negligence seriously. I find, upon examining your different letters, that two have been lost, the one you sent by Lord Deerhurst, and one you mention to have sent by an Indiaman. You have probably heard the story of Deerhurst's already. He says that when he came to London, he heard I was at Mistley,[1] and so put the letter in the post. The letter never arrived at Mistley, nor could any trace be found of it at any of the post-offices near Mistley. What to think of the matter is difficult, but it vexed me extremely, as it

[1] It should seem by this that Mr. Fox was still in habits with Rigby, whose place Mistley was.—V. H.

was your first letter from America, and might possibly contain many interesting things. All your other letters I have received, and am beyond measure obliged to you for them. I think you are the best describer of military operations I ever knew, for I perfectly understand them by your letters, which I scarce ever do from those of others. What a scene of folly it has been! But it has not yet had all the effect here that you at a distance imagine it would have. I think you are too violent in some of your ideas, but, as this letter may possibly be read by others as well as you, I cannot now tell you my mind upon those subjects. What the Ministers intend doing besides keeping their places, upon which they are very decided, I cannot even guess. They know as little how to make peace as war. In short, they are as completely at a *non plus* as people can be; but they still keep a great majority, though we begin to increase considerably; we divided last night (2d February, on motion for a state of the nation) 165 to 259, which is certainly a very good division compared with the past, but a very bad one in my mind considering the circumstances of the country. I made the motion in a very long speech, in which I went over the whole of the American business, and I really thought the House went a good deal with me in most of it. I purposely avoided all topics that related to the justice of the war, and confined myself merely to the absurdity of it in all its parts, and the absolute madness of continuing it. The resolution moved was that none of the old corps now in Europe should be spared for the American war. We had several Tories with us, and I really think it was a great day for us. The Ministry, not by concert, I believe, but by accident, did not say one word, which scandalized even their own friends a good deal, as I had opened the affair so very fully; for I spoke two hours and forty minutes. They now pretend to say that Ellis and Wedderburne were up (I did not see them), and while they were complimenting one another, the question was put. The fact is, that it is such a cause as no man can defend well, and therefore nobody likes to attempt it. We shall soon go into an inquiry upon the Canada Expedition, in which how

Lord G. [George Germaine] will defend himself, is much above my comprehension. They mean to be hard upon Burgoyne, which is a baseness beyond what even you or I could have expected from them. The inquiry is also in my hands, so that I have business enough, indeed more than I can well manage; for, though I like the House of Commons itself, I hate the preparatory business of looking at accounts, drawing motions, &c., as much as you could do. *I am convinced we shall so far succeed as to get great divisions* in the House of Commons, and to convince all the world that the Ministers deserve all possible contempt; *but when we have done that, I think we shall have done all we can do, and that the Ministers, though despised everywhere, and by everybody, will still continue Ministers. I am thoroughly persuaded of this,* but the general opinion is otherwise. There is a report of Lord Chatham being to come in immediately, but I have good reasons for totally disbelieving it. I think I have given you enough of politics, considering I have nothing but reports and conjectures to give you. With respect to my own share, I can only say that people flatter me that I continue to gain, rather than lose, my credit as an orator; and *I am so convinced that this is all that I ever shall gain (unless I choose to become the meanest of men), that I never think of any other object of ambition.*

"*I am certainly ambitious by nature,* but I really have, or think I have, totally subdued that passion. I have still as much vanity as ever, which is a happier passion by far; because great reputation I think I may acquire and *keep,* great situation I *never* can acquire, nor, if acquired, *keep without making sacrifices that I never will make.* If I am wrong, and more sanguine people right, *tant mieux,* and I shall be as happy as they can be; but if I am right, I am sure I shall be the happier for having made up my mind to my situation. I need not say how happy I am at the thoughts of your coming; I should be so at all times, but I really want you at present to a great degree. I have other friends whom I love, and who I believe love me, but I foresee possible cases where I am determined to act against all the advice

that they are likely to give me. I know they will not shake me, for nothing ever shall; but yet it would be a great satisfaction to have you here, who I know would be of my opinion. You guess, I dare say, the sort of cases I mean. I shall be told by prudent friends that I am under no sort of engagements to any set of men. *I certainly am not*, but there are many cases where there is no engagement, and yet it is dishonorable not to act as if there was one. But even suppose it were quite honorable, is it possible to be happy in acting with people of whom one has the worst opinions, and being on a cold footing (which must be the case) with all those whom one loves best, and with whom one passes one's life? I have talked to you a great deal about myself, but I know it will interest you, and I have really little else to tell you, as I know Ossory has written to you. Hare and Jack Townshend are well. Bully [Lord Bolingbroke] was believed by everybody to be married to a Miss Curtis, with 50,000*l.*, but it was all off, I do not know how. He and I, and several others, are just going to dine at nine o'clock at Derby's. The old Duke [Devonshire] I like better than ever; Foley's affairs are likely to be settled to his mind. Is there anybody else to mention? Lord Robert goes on as usual. Egremont has lived lately too much in the country. *En general, tout va son train.* Selwyn has been cut up for a large sum, after having been fattening for a month, and the old fish [Mr. Crawford] is constantly talking of the certainty of his brother's being ruined, and so the world goes on.—Adieu. Dickson begs to be remembered to you. Pray give my kindest love to my brother, and tell him I should be very glad to have now and then a line from him. Do not expect to find any change in politics when you arrive, for, if you do, you will be most certainly disappointed. I can find nobody of our side, but Lord Camden and Burke, who agree with me in desponding, but depend upon it we are right. We are, and *ever shall be*, as much proscribed as ever the Jacobites were formerly.

"Adieu,

"Yours, most affectionately,

"C. J. FOX."

This admirable and amiable letter seems to foresee, to explain, and to justify Mr. Fox's conduct throughout his life, in private and public. It contains the most artless yet forcible expressions of friendship and confidence to the person who was to the day of his death his chief adviser and dearest friend. It lays down the fixed principles which were the guide of his political career. It announces his determination to adhere to the doctrines and the party of the Whigs, while it proves that he was aware that such adherence could lead to neither power nor emolument, and that he could avoid it and adopt a more profitable course without exposing himself to the reproach of breaking any engagement.—V. H.

February 6. "Wonderful speech of Burke on Burgoyne's invitation to Indians: his wit made North, Rigby, and Ministers laugh; his pathos drew tears down Barré's cheeks."

On the 10th, "The Ministers apprehending a motion from Charles Fox, and alarmed at late increase of the minority," urgently pressed their friends, and brought down even the sick. "Charles Fox did carry [down] a string of twelve motions. The first, which was debated till night, was for a regular and general state of the army, seconded by George Grenville; the debate was a heavy one, and the motion rejected by 263 to 149."

February 17. "A day ever memorable as one of the most ignominious in the English annals." Lord North[1] opened his conciliatory plan, ventured on taking the very opposite part to all his administration had been doing, and presumed to tell the three kingdoms that they must abandon all the high views with which they had been lulled, and must stoop to beg peace of America at any rate. He declared he would treat with the Congress, with anybody; would even allow the independence of the colonies, not verbally, but virtually; owned his disappointments, and recurred to his usual defence. Every Act had been the act of the House and of Parliament. All the comfort he gave the country gentlemen was some hopes that America might

[1] Abridged from H. Walpole's account by Lord Holland.—J. R.

be induced to contribute some pecuniary assistance. This was the pith of his speech. "The astonishment of great part of the House at such extensive offers *precluded all expression.* The Opposition felt honestly they could not decently disapprove a pacification they had so much recommended, and during the course of the bill the Ministers had the satisfaction of finding this integrity operate on some of the most upright, but least clear-sighted. Lord G. Cavendish and Frederick Montague pressed the Ministers not to lose a moment in passing the bills, an instance of more virtue than judgment. The Tories, who could not like concessions so inadequate to their hopes and so repugnant to their high-flown attachment to the Prerogative, seeing the intemperate zeal of the Opposition, were ashamed to mark themselves as an obstinate and weak party, which they would be if they separated from the Court when approved by Opposition. Burke and Charles Fox yielded to and seconded the torrent, but the latter threw a bomb that much disconcerted, though it did not disappoint, the Minister. My cousin, Thomas Walpole, had acquainted me that the treaty with France was signed. We agreed to inform Charles Fox, but, as we both distrusted Burke, and feared the childish fluctuations of Lord Rockingham, we determined that Fox should know nothing of the secret till an hour or two before the House met. Accordingly, Thomas Walpole communicated the notice of the treaty to the Duke of Grafton on the 16th, and engaged him to acquaint Charles Fox but just before the House should meet next day. This was done most exactly, and Burke knew nothing of the matter till he came into the House. As soon as Lord North had opened his two bills, Charles Fox rose, and after pluming himself on having sat there till he had brought the noble Lord to concur in sentiments with him and his friends, he astonished Lord North by asking him whether a commercial treaty with France had not been signed by the American agents at Paris within the last ten days? 'If so,' said he, 'the Administration is beaten by ten days, a situation so threatening that in such a time of danger the House must concur with the propositions, though

probably now they would have no effect.' Lord North was thunderstruck, and would not rise.

"Burke maintained that Lord North had taken precisely the plan that he [Burke] had offered two years before, and he called on him to answer to the fact of the treaty. Still the Minister was silent, till Sir G. Savile rose and told him that it would be criminal and a matter of impeachment to withhold an answer, and ended with crying, 'An answer! an answer! an answer!' Lord North, thus forced up, owned he had heard a report of the treaty, but desired to give no answer to the House at that moment; he had no official intelligence on that subject. The report might be vague. Some time ago, the Ministers of France had denied it. Such evasive answers convinced everybody of the truth of the report."

March 3. "The conciliatory bills were passed by the House of Commons. Towards the end of the debate [when Charles Fox was gone out of the House], Lord G. Germaine rose, and declared he looked upon himself as responsible for these pacific measures."

March 6. On the Budget, "Charles Fox poured out the bitterest and one of the finest of all his philippics against Lord North, taxing him with breach of honor in having declared that he would resign if his first conciliatory proposition had not the desired effect; that he had broken his word, that he had this year brought measures of the same kind, at which he confessed he felt humbled, though not ashamed; if such measures did not make him blush, what would? And in this style he spoke for above half an hour."

March 9. On Gilbert's motion of a tax of twenty-five per cent. on places and pensions during war, which was carried against Lord North; Sir G. Savile, Burke, and Fox voted with the Ministry, as did General Conway too. Burke and Conway spoke. "In the House of Commons, the inquiry was carried into the state of the Navy, as it had been in the other House, and Charles Fox exerted himself in exposing the ill conduct of the Admiralty, and of Lord North, whom he treated with the

utmost contempt and indignity." On the 13th, M. de Noailles communicated the fact of a treaty of commerce and amity between his most Christian Majesty and the Independent States of America.

March 16. On a motion for Lord Stormont's correspondence, "Mr. Burke, Mr. Dunning, Mr. Fox, particularly the latter, censured Lord North most severely for ignorance and for the situation into which the Ministers had brought the nation, and with great contempt for proposing unanimity."

March 17. In the House of Commons, on an amendment for removal of Ministers, for which Mr. Baker, Sir G. Yonge, Conolly, George Grenville, and Thomas Pitt had spoken, and on which General Conway had made a long speech, "Charles Fox paid the highest compliments to Conway's integrity and abilities, said he should differ from him in nothing but in demanding the immediate dismission of Ministers; would declare the independence of America, and turn the commissioners into ambassadors. He said, Lord North had talked much of the confusion his resigning would occasion. He did not see how; he did see what confusion his staying would make."

March 19 "was a very remarkable day in the House of Commons. The inquiry was to be summed up upon the expedition of Burgoyne; and Charles Fox undertook to charge Lord G. Germaine as the author of that miscarriage, by not having given orders sufficiently explicit to General Howe to endeavor to meet and assist Burgoyne. Fox made the charge with extraordinary temper and judgment, and without any acrimony. He said that he saw too many of the King's servants were involved in criminality to make personal bitterness to any single man excusable. He condemned, he said, the Canadian expedition; but the ignorance of the Ministers of the treaty between France and the Americans had effaced that, and next year he supposed it would be so much exceeded by new blunders, that he should forget it. He was sorry, in this ignorance, to be forced to include *his own friend* Lord Weymouth. These parts of his speech gave the chief color to the day. Thurlow, Lord Weymouth's creature

and intimate, was very angry, and with bitter irony said he hoped Mr. Fox would never be his friend. Fox rose to excuse himself, but launched out still more severely against Lord Weymouth." —"Towards three in the morning, the debate took a new and very warm turn. The Lord Advocate Dundas, who seemed to be set up by the Court against Charles Fox, rose and taunted him with his moderation, and called on him to employ his usual invectives. He had, at the beginning of the session, said the Lord Advocate, overflowed with bitterness; now he had sifted the conduct of Ministers, he found nothing to say against them. This speech, and the small minority and support of his friends, several of whom had gone away from lassitude and the insipidity of the day, provoked Fox to the utmost rage. He burst out into a torrent of abuse, and lost all temper and conduct." After Lord G. Germaine's speech [which, says Walpole, was a good one], "Charles Fox should have made his motion of censure on Lord George, which he had prepared, but in his passion he tore the paper and went away. Charles Fox said to many he would attend the House no more, of which probably the King heard; for next day, Lord Bolingbroke, Fox's friend, being in waiting, the King, who used to abhor Fox's name, launched out into commendations of him."

"Fitzpatrick had distinguished himself" in America, and, in an "admirable letter" to his brother, Lord Ossory, "expressed his impatience to return, saying he was far more rooted in his principles from his admiration of the noble behavior of the Americans and their love of freedom, and disgusted with the army, who were grown to abhor the name of Whigs, and had lost all attachment to liberty."

April 6. "Sir W. Meredith, in the House of Commons, moved for a repeal of all the acts inimical to the Americans. In the course of the debate, Mr. Fox and Mr. Burke spoke for greater indulgence to Roman Catholics."[1]

[1] I suspect Walpole means to cast a censure on Burke and Fox for these opinions. His (Walpole's) virulence against Catholics is most in-

While such were the debates in Parliament, negotiations had been carried on by the Court—for at least a partial change of Ministry; but in order to make these intelligible, I must refer to a correspondence of the King, of a somewhat earlier period.

[On the 4th of December, 1777, after accounts had arrived of the surrender of General Burgoyne and his army at Saratoga, the King congratulated Lord North on his "firmness in supporting the reverses in America." In less than two months (31st January, 1778) afterwards, he writes to him]: "I should have been greatly surprised at the inclination expressed by you to retire, had I not known that, however you may now and then despond, yet that you have too much personal affection for me and sense of honor, to allow such a thought to take any hold on your mind." [This observation was doubtless intended to deter Lord North from his wish to retire. But in the following March this desire took a more definite shape, and it became necessary to allow Lord North to make some attempts to form a stronger government. In these negotiations, the leading idea of Lord North was to retire in favor of another administration; that of the King was to preserve the men and the measures, with some assistance to aid the one and carry the other.]

"It is clear," says Lord Holland, "from Lord North's correspondence with the King, from notes of Mr. Eden, afterwards Lord Auckland, and from other papers, that previous to, in, and about 1778, several negotiations more or less distinct, and all very secret, were opened with different persons in Opposition, and among them, one through Mr. Eden with Mr. Fox, and another through the same agent, and very mysterious and secret, with Lord Shelburne. The object of these negotiations was styled by those employed in them, 'Secret negotiations for a new arrangement,' and it was explicitly stated by them that 'no arrangement could or would be ever listened to one moment except

veterate. One of his charges against Government is their toleration, and one of his insinuations against George III. that he was half a papist!—V. H.

on the ground of more accession of capacity for business in a moment which would require great exertions.' The negotiation with Lord Shelburne seems to have gone off from the large, vague, and general terms demanded by Lord Chatham, without whom Lord Shelburne said 'no good could be done, and with whom nothing but an entire change of Cabinet and law appointments would be practicable.' It appears that many similar and previous communications between the Ministry and Lord Chatham had taken place; and perhaps they continued till the day of his seizure in the House of Lords, which occurred early in April."

What passed between Mr. Eden and Mr. Fox on the 15th March, 1778, is related in the subjoined notes of the former gentleman.

It confirms, what appears from many other documents, that, even up to 1778, Mr. Fox considered himself, and was considered by others, as unconnected with any party, and at liberty to act without concert, though not much disposed to do so.—V. H.

"SECRET NEGOTIATIONS FOR A NEW ARRANGEMENT IN MARCH, 1778, WHICH FAILED.

"I wrote a note to Mr. Charles Fox that I wished to see him, and would call upon him, if he could spare five minutes from the politics of the day. He came immediately to my house and dined alone with me. After exchanging assurances that nothing which might pass between us should ever go farther than to those to whom I might think myself responsible, and never to any friend of his except with my previous consent, we entered into conversation on the expediency of some arrangement for the purpose of strengthening both the apparent and real efficiency of Government at this crisis. I rather speculated on changes than proposed any. The removal of the American Secretary was much liked. An office like the Treasury of the Navy was allowed to be more eligible than a responsible office. The acquisition of the Shelburnes was said to be not improbable. Mr. Fox stated himself to be unconnected and at liberty. He also said

that, except with Lord G. G., he could act with the present Ministers; but he disavowed every possibility of accepting singly and alone, and even doubted whether he could accept in any case; but he expressed a desire to hear again from me if any other set should accede, and hinted that in case of an actual arrangement he should hope some regard would be shown to his friends Mr. Fitzpatrick and Lord Ossory.[1] Many particulars occurred in the course of the three hours: upon the whole, it appeared sufficiently practicable to obtain his assistance, if he could be kept in countenance by others. I am convinced that he will make no bad use of the conversation, but in other respects will be as hostile as ever. In talking about the Canada business, he professed himself much embarrassed with it, and showed me a very long list of resolutions. At a quarter past seven, I called on Dr. Priestley, who introduced Lord Shelburne to me, and left us. We sat together till half-past ten, though he told me at first that he was appointed at eight o'clock to attend an Opposition meeting [at the Duke of Richmond's]. I confided to him my copy of the French Ambassador's Declaration (which I knew, however, that he was already in possession of). He read it aloud, as a paper quite new to him, but commented on it very frankly, and said that it was impossible to consider it otherwise than as a declaration of war; that we must act accordingly; that New York should be strongly armed; the frontiers of Canada secured; Florida strengthened; Pennsylvania evacuated; the fisheries defended; the West India Islands and all other possessions secured; the proposed Commission desisted from, as now become nugatory, but all the American Acts to be repealed; measures of force against France to be adopted. In talking of himself, he said that he abhorred intrigue; that his temper and feelings led him to the utmost unreserve and frankness; that his disposition was best suited to private life; that he was naturally indolent, &c. &c.; that he ab-

[1] I cannot believe this account of Mr. Fox's conversation to be correct. It is quite inconsistent with Mr. Fox's letter to Fitzpatrick of the previous month. What follows confirms my doubts.—J. R.

horred all parties; that, when gentlemen of Opposition came to him, he always advised them to prefer Lord Rockingham; that when anything was said to him tending to a connection with Government, he could say nothing but that 'Lord Chatham must be the dictator.' When I asked him what Lord Chatham would dictate, he said that I must have heard, both through the Duke of Northumberland and *through another channel;* that, when his Majesty last parted with Lord Chatham, his Majesty was pleased to say he foresaw he should, on future occasions, want his advice and assistance, and that the occasion was now come. He knew, he said, that Lord Chatham thought any change insufficient which did not comprehend and annihilate every party in the kingdom; that the Duke of Grafton and Lord Rockingham must be included; that a great law arrangement would, in Lord Chatham's opinion, be material; and that Lord Mansfield ought to be removed. He was liberal in solemn assurances to me that no one syllable of our conversation should ever transpire; was sorry, he said, to collect nothing from me that tended to produce a general reformation in Government. He professed no disregard to Lord Suffolk and Lord North (possibly through politeness), but dwelt with some asperity on Lord Gower's principles of Government and on Lord George's insufficiency (in which he made some allusions to General Carlton). He intimated that Lord Chatham would not wish, perhaps, to give the Treasury to Lord Rockingham, but would perhaps offer to make him Lord Chamberlain. It was agreed in the close of our conversation that we should mutually act as if we had never met, but that I should call again on Tuesday evening at a quarter past eight. He criticized Lord Sandwich for having seen Mr. Keppel[1] yesterday, without saying one word to him on the subject of an immediate war with France.

"March 17. Tuesday night, at half-past eight, I went to Lord Shelburne's, as by agreement of Sunday night. We met at the same moment, at his gate. The conversation began on the de-

[1] Admiral Keppel.

bate he had just had in the House of Lords, in which he had made a speech by no means unfriendly to Government, though personally harsh to Lord Mansfield. The turn of his speech was to show the extent and greatness of the affront offered by France, and the impossibility of not resenting it. In repeating what he had said to me, he added that the present Ministers would be bold to a degree of desperation, if, though the war was necessary, they ventured to conduct it; for that losses of much importance must be expected from the measures which France had undoubtedly taken against us, and such losses so immediately on the back of other misfortunes would be too much for any Government to stand. When I answered to this, that every good Minister, in a crisis like this, would naturally wish to add any strength to his Majesty's councils that could honorably be obtained, he replied that we were precluding all new accessions by giving the great promotions of the army and law to men of whose assistance we were already in full possession, and that every promotion among the present set would become an obstacle to any new arrangement. I asked him what his idea was of a new arrangement. He answered that *without* Lord Chatham it would be inefficient, and do more harm than good to make any change; and that *with* Lord Chatham nothing could be done, but by an entire new Cabinet, and a change in the chief departments of the law. That this idea did not go to a total alteration of men and measures, only to an alteration of Ministers, and the giving force and weight to the measures which the situation of the country might render necessary or expedient. As to the law, he said, that the great offices ought not to be filled by lawyers, who were mere mischievous politicians. In answer to the last sentence, I asked what he meant to do with his friends, Lord Camden and Mr. Dunning. He did not choose to understand what was implied by this, but answered that he wished to see the one Chancellor and the other Chief Justice, in the room of Lord Mansfield, who he supposed *must* wish to retire. I then desired to know how he proposed to manage the House of Commons, without any lawyers of eminence, except the present Attorney and Solicitor-

Generals, who would then be both in Opposition. He allowed this would be a difficulty, and said, 'But surely there would be some mode of doing everything right, without doing anything harsh.' This gave me the opening I wished, to enter fully and in the plainest language into the narrowness, nonsense, and harshness of the whole proposition, so far as implied a wish and expectation in his lordship's friend at Hayes, to avail himself of the pressure of a moment in order to dictate terms to the closet, every part of which would imply a desertion and disavowal of servants who for many years had fought the cause of their master, of the Parliament, and of the whole nation, with the most cordial fidelity and zeal; and this, too, upon principles of the purest kind, the truth of which remains unimpaired, though mischances and circumstances may make it more difficult to enforce them. I added that, though uninformed and unauthorized as to any specific resolutions taken, I could argue safely from the sentiments of honor which I knew to be firmly rooted, and could at once say that no arrangement could or would ever be listened to one moment except on the ground of mere accession of capacity and business, in a moment which would require great exertions, and that even such accessions could not be taken, unless made in a plan consistent with the honor of all that had passed heretofore. In the conversation of at least four hours which followed this opening, many particulars passed, and much detail was entered into as to persons and political characters. In the result, his lordship seemed to take a more practicable key, and said he would go this morning to Hayes, would endeavor to learn the outlines of the expectations formed, and would confide them to me on his return, in the most secret confidence, that no bad use should be made of them, if they were thought totally inadmissible. I was desired to meet him again to-night at nine.

"March 18, 9 P. M. I found Lord Shelburne to-night affectedly reserved and mysterious on all political subjects, and in the opposite extreme as to every point of politeness and attention.

"He said he had found Lord Chatham in good health and spirits, and full of speculations on the present crisis. That in

talking of Lord Shelburne's speech yesterday, Lord Chatham had complimented him so far as to say he was sure they would think alike on any subject, though in different parts of the globe, and out of the reach of consultation.

"He added, *en passant*, that Lord Chatham would come to town to-morrow, in order to hold the same language in Parliament [for war and against independency].

"As to any proposal of an arrangement, he only said that he found it a beaten subject with Lord Chatham, quite worn out. He added very significantly, that Lord Chatham knew more than I had communicated. I desired an explanation, to which he only answered, 'Lord Chatham knows *more* than *we* do, at least more than I did before I saw him to-day; it is a beaten subject.' I asked if he alluded to the Duke of Northumberland, or the other channel mentioned on Sunday. He said, 'no; more,' and then proceeded to tell me that it was not yet the time for them to serve either the court or the country, and that he found himself much happier in a retired station. This was followed with civil invitations to me to meet him and his friends, some of whom I happen to know intimately (not upon politics), and with advice to me to avoid going to America. I answered that I would reserve private subjects of conversation for quieter times, and asked if he and his friends meant in plain English to be impracticable; to which he replied, that Lord Chatham was very practicable, but that he (Lord S.) could not say how. We had then some loose disjointed conversation, intimating on his part that the French would be very alert in their enterprises, and on mine, that we must be equally alert in our exertions.

"The visit did not last half an hour, and I took leave without any further appointment."

I will now give extracts from such parts of the King's correspondence with Lord North as relate to these negotiations, beginning with a letter which had no date, but is evidently the letter of the 15th referred to in the note of the 16th March, 1778:—

"On a subject which has for many months engrossed my thoughts, I cannot have the smallest difficulty instantly to answer the letter I have just received from you. My sole wish is to keep you at the head of the Treasury, and as my confidential Minister. That end obtained, I am willing through your channel to accept any description of persons that will come avowedly to the support of your Administration, and as such I do not object to Lord Shelburne and Mr. Barré, who personally, perhaps, I dislike as much as Alderman Wilkes, and I cannot give you a stronger proof of my desire to forward your wishes than taking the unpleasant step." . . . "But I declare in the strongest and most solemn manner that though I do not object to your addressing yourself to Lord Chatham, yet that you must acquaint him that I shall never address myself to him but through you, and on a clear explanation that he is to step forth to support an Administration wherein you are First Lord of the Treasury, and that I cannot consent to have any conversation with him, till the Ministry is formed; that, if he comes into this, I will, as he supports you, receive him with open arms. I leave the whole arrangement to you, provided Lord Suffolk, Lord Weymouth, and my two able lawyers are satisfied as to their situations, but choose Ellis for Secretary at War in preference to Barré, who on that event will get a more lucrative employment, but will not be so near my person. Having said this, I will only add, to put before your eyes my most inward thoughts, that no advantage to this country, nor personal danger to myself, can ever make me address myself to Lord Chatham, or any other branch of Opposition. Honestly, I would rather lose the crown I now wear than bear the ignominy of possessing it under their shackles. I might write volumes, if I would state the feelings of my mind, and what I will never depart from. Should Lord Chatham wish to see me before he gives his answer, I shall most certainly refuse it. I have had enough of personal negotiations, and neither my dignity nor my feelings will ever let me again submit to it. Men of less principle and honesty than I pretend to may look on public measures as a game. I always act from conviction, but I am shocked at the base arts all these men have

used; therefore cannot go towards them; if they come to your assistance, I will accept them. You have now full powers to act, but I do not expect Lord Chatham and his crew will come to your assistance; but if they do not, I trust the rest of the arrangement will greatly strengthen, as it will give efficiency to the Administration. Thurlow as Chancellor, Yorke as Secretary of State, will be efficient men. Numbers we have already. Lord Dartmouth as Steward, and Lord Weymouth Privy Seal, will please them both, I am certain. Lord W.'s conduct, on your last vacancy of the seals, gives him a right to this change, if agreeable to him."

"*March* 16, 1778.

"You can want no further explanation of the language held to Mr. Eden the last evening. It is so totally contrary to the only ground on which I could have accepted the services of *that perfidious man*,[1] that I need not enter on it. Lord Chatham as dictator—as planning a new Administration—I appeal to my letter of yesterday if I did not clearly speak out upon. If Lord Chatham agrees to support your Administration, (if you like better) the fundamentals of the present Administration, viz., Lord N. at the head of the Treasury; Lords Suffolk, Gower, and Weymouth, in great offices to their own inclinations; Lord Sandwich at the Admiralty, Thurlow Chancellor, and Wedderburne as Chief Justice, I will not object to see that great man, when Lord Shelburne, Dunning, and Barré are placed already in office; but I solemnly declare that nothing shall bring me to treat personally with Lord Chatham. If I saw Lord C., he would insist on as total a change as Lord Shelburne yesterday threw out.

"*Same day.*

"I am fully convinced that you are actuated alone from a wish not to conceal the most private corners of your breast in writing the letter you have just sent unto me; but, my dear Lord, it is not private pique, but an opinion formed on an experience of now

[1] Lord Chatham.

seventeen years, that makes me resolve to run any personal risk rather than submit to Opposition, which every plan deviating from strengthening the present Administration is more or less tending to. I am certain, while I can have no one object in view but to be of use to the country, it is impossible I can be deserted, and the road opened to a set of men who certainly would make me a slave for the remainder of my days; and, whatever they may pretend, would go to the most unjustifiable lengths of cruelty and destruction of those who have stood forth in public offices, of which you would be the first victim."

"*March* 17, 1778.

"I am grieved at your continually recurring to a subject on which we can never agree. Your letter is certainly personally affectionate to me, and shows no sign of personal fear; but, my dear Lord, no consideration in life shall make me stoop to Opposition. I am still ready to accept any part of them that will come to the assistance of my present efficient Ministers; but whilst any ten men in the kingdom will stand by me, I will not give myself up to bondage. My dear Lord, I will rather risk my crown than do what I think personally disgraceful. It is impossible this nation should not stand by me. If they will not, they shall have another King, for I never will put my hand to what will make me miserable to the last hour of my life. Therefore, let Thurlow instantly know that I will appoint him Chancellor; and the Solicitor-General, that if he does not choose to be Attorney-General, we will treat with the Chief Justice of the Common Pleas to resign."

"*March* 18, 1778.

"I am highly incensed at the language held by Lord Shelburne last night to Eden, and approve of that of the latter. I am fairly worn down. But all proposals and answers must in future go through you, for I will not change the Administration; but if I can with honor, let you make the acquisitions."

"*March* 18, 1778.

"Convey to Thurlow and Wedderburne my intentions. Then, and not till then, I am open to the plan of Ministry proposed by you on Sunday. I never will accept the service of any part of Opposition but to strengthen *you*. To give *you* ease, I consent to what gives me infinite pain, but any further, even that consideration would not make me go. Rather than be shackled by those desperate men (if the nation will not stand by me), I will rather see any form of government introduced into this island, and lose my Crown rather than wear it as a disgrace."

"*22d March, half-past eight, A. M.*

"I can scarcely express my disappointment at finding that all the uneasiness and labor I have undergone for the whole week has not convinced you that, though you are unhappily too diffident of your own abilities, yet that you ought also to consider that you have changed your ground since Sunday. I will never consent to removing the members of the present Cabinet from my service. I am extremely indifferent whether Lord Granby goes or does not go with the abject message of the Rockingham party to Hayes. I will certainly send none to that place."

"My dear Lord—Your always recurring to a total change of Administration obliges me to ask you one clear question. If I will not by your advice take the step which I look on as disgraceful to myself, and destruction to my family, are you resolved, agreeable to the example of the Duke of Grafton at the hour of danger, to desert me?"

"*March* 23, 1778.

"I cannot return the message without expressing my satisfaction at your determination not to desert at this hour, which indeed I always thought your sense of honor would prevent."

"*March* 29, 1778.

"Your constant recurrence to a measure I think destructive—your avowed despondency, which is highly detrimental to my service, obliges me to the three following questions: 1. Do you think it possible to strengthen the present Administration by an accession of some men of talents from the Opposition? 2. If that cannot be effected, will you consent to continue and try to exert yourself and co-operate with me in putting vigor and activity to every department? 3. If you decline continuing, you cannot, I suppose, refuse residing at the Treasury and finishing the business of this session, and not be surprised at my taking such steps as I think necessary for strengthening my Administration, the first of which will be my giving the Great Seal to the Attorney-General" [Thurlow].

"*March* 30, 1778.

"I am sorry to perceive that, by declining the first two questions, you have adopted the third. It would be useless to describe the pain I feel at the prospect of losing you. Send to Mr. Thurlow, and inform him that I intend the Great Seal and a peerage for him; and as I wish to do everything for your ease, not detrimental to my service, I authorize you to persuade Mr. Wedderburne not to quit the House of Commons till the end of the session. Tell him it will be a conduct I shall never forget, and one of your last acts shall be to complete the arrangement with the Chief Justice that he may preside at the Common Pleas."

"*March* 31.

"Pleased at Lord North's consent to remain after the session as long as was necessary for arrangements."

"*April* 1, 1788.

"The letter I have just received from you is in the affectionate style I used to find ever to be called forth in you when my service

was concerned, and so very unlike the coldness and despondency of your correspondence for some time that I cannot refrain from the pleasure of expressing satisfaction at it."

The substance as well as temper of the preceding letters shows that Lord North was continually pressing the King to change his measures, and to admit either a portion or the whole of the party opposed to the American war—a fact from which the biographer of Mr. Fox will not fail to infer that, in the subsequent coalition of 1783, there was no dereliction of principle on either side, and that the inconsistency of the parties was more apparent than real. —V. H.[1]

On the 7th of April happened the memorable seizure of Lord Chatham in the House of Lords, the immediate precursor of his death.

On the 8th of April, the King writes to Lord North: "May not the political exit of Lord Chatham incline you to continue at the head of my affairs?" In this hope also he was disappointed, for in ten days afterwards he says: "As your letter plainly shows that you at all events expect to be released from your situation at the end of this session, and that you cannot extricate yourself for even that small period, if the law arrangements you yourself proposed to me take place, I think it best, on the whole, to make no arrangement this recess, and you are therefore dispensed from taking any steps concerning the present Attorney and Solicitor-Generals, or any successor to them." Other letters follow, with more or less urgency on the part of the King, and more or less hesitation on the part of Lord North. On the 12th of May, the King writes to him: "As the fresh touching on the wish to retire convinces me of Lord North's intention at all events to resign, I can only add that, as soon as he has arranged the day of Mr. Thurlow's receiving the Great Seal, I will, when I have that

[1] I cannot assent to this remark of Lord Holland. Lord North actually carried on the American War: it will hardly add to his reputation to show that he involved the Old and the New World in useless bloodshed against his own opinion.—J. R.

office in such respectable hands, not lose an hour in consulting with the new Chancellor, and with some of my principal Ministers now in the Cabinet, how least to the detriment of the public service to supply what I must ever look on as a great loss. Lord North will by this perceive, the sooner he can notify that the road is clear for my nominating a Chancellor, the sooner he will be freed from his present uneasy situation." Five days afterwards he says: "Why is that appointment of Mr. Thurlow not concluded? You want to retire, yet will not take the first step to enable me to acquiesce in your request."

[On the 1st of June, Thurlow was raised to the peerage and made Lord Chancellor, and two days afterwards Parliament was prorogued. Lord North seems to have lost no time in renewing his application for leave to retire, for on the 16th the King writes to him:] "Lord North's application to resign within two days after the prorogation, I can see in no other light than a continuation of his resolution to retire whenever my affairs will permit it. For I never can think that he, who so handsomely stood forward on the desertion of the Duke of Grafton, would lose all that merit by following so undignified an example."

I now return to Horace Walpole's summary of the debates.

April 10, 1778. "On a motion of Powys, the Scotch Advocate [Dundas] again spoke most intemperately for pursuing the attempt of conquering America, and was well answered by Burke and Fox."—H. W.

May 7. The King's message, and Lord North's motion for the grant of a million. "T. Townshend, Charles Fox, and Mr. Burke attacked the Ministers with great warmth on their receiving an account of the sailing of the Toulon fleet on the Monday, and not calling a Council even to give orders till the Wednesday. Mr. Fox even hinted having heard that Lord G. Germaine was so dissatisfied with the other Ministers that he had threatened to resign. Lord George did not positively deny this, and, though in a soft way he pleaded that Ministers had been out of town, his gestures, while Fox was speaking, seemed to agree to all he said."

May 21. "Burgoyne appeared in House of Commons, and in

reply to a question of Mr. Vyner, said, 'he was ready to answer anything, and should declare some things that would astonish everybody.' He had intended to have Charles Fox question him in order to bring out what he wished, a step that both showed he thought himself, and made him desperate with Ministers."

May 26. On question, whether Burgoyne, being a prisoner, could be interrogated or examined, Charles Fox, in answer to Lord G. Germaine, "wondered there could be any doubt of trying the General, when the Minister, Lord George, had been tried, and his conduct had appeared so unsatisfactory that the Committee had made no report to the House; and he moved to extend the inquiry to the whole measure of the Expedition."

May 28. "Wedderburne objected to Burgoyne's sitting in Parliament while a prisoner, but gave most absurd reasons. Fox made a very masterly[1] and severe speech against Lord North; but the motion to address the Crown, not to prorogue, was lost by 105 to 53."

June 2. Sir James Lowther moved to renew the motion against prorogation. "This was objected to by the Court, when Richard Fitzpatrick, brother of Lord Ossory, and a great friend of Charles Fox, having arrived the day before from America, rose and gave a strong account of the extreme dissatisfaction the conciliatory plan had occasioned in the army and *contempt in the Americans.* He complained that the army had been promised 20,000 recruits, and had been deceived; commended General Howe, and complained bitterly how ill that General, Burgoyne, and Carleton had been treated by the Administration."

June 3. "Session ended."

* This session of Parliament was rendered forever memorable by the death of Lord Chatham. Factious in the commencement of his career, and impracticable at the close, he was yet a great man, and the only great man of England during his period. His flashes of eloquence scattered his opponents; and his war measures swept the enemies of his country before them. He loved and

[1] It was one of his best speeches, full of sense and matter.—H. W.

venerated liberty; was free from all personal corruption, and, with a sagacity and boldness seldom equalled, raised the glory and greatness of his country.*—J. R.

Mr. Fox, in a letter to Mr. Fitzpatrick of the 11th of November, 1778, consults Mr. Fitzpatrick about the course they ought to take in the ensuing session of Parliament. "I am afraid," he says, "that Keppel and Palliser will engross so much of the public attention, and that of some of our friends especially, that many more important things may be neglected. I think our line of conduct more nice and difficult than ever, considering all things. I am always inclined to think the straight line the best; but yet to contrive so as to set against us that very great number of people, who think as ill of Ministry as we do, and yet are not ripe for such a conduct as you and I may think right, would surely be imprudent. If the acknowledgment of independence would not procure peace, it is certainly useless. I own my present idea (considering all things as well at home as abroad) is rather with Lord Shelburne for being silent on that subject, but acting as if it were acknowledged, withdrawing our troops from North America, and making the most vigorous attacks upon France, or possibly Spain too. Whatever may be the conditions of alliance between the States and France, I cannot help thinking that they would act very lukewarmly against us, when they found themselves wholly uninterested in the war and engaged merely by a point of honor. That all this would be much surer of producing the effect proposed, if the independence were acknowledged, I see very clearly; but we must consider a little the state of things at home, and think what is practicable as well as what is best. This is at present my opinion, but it is very liable to be altered by a thousand circumstances, of which it is impossible for me now to judge, and therefore I need not say that it is an opinion I could by no means wish to have known. Pray let me know what you think of the matter. With respect to Lord Bute, &c., I have no opinion at all. As to Mr. Pitt's letter, I think it (as you do) very good, but have no doubt at all of its being his own, from what little I have seen of him. What you say of Sandwich surprises

me, for my notion was that he was extraordinarily well at Court." [It is a curious coincidence of opinion, that it was the first impression of the King, on intelligence of a probable rupture with France, that we should] "withdraw the greatest part of our troops from America, and employ them against the French and Spanish settlements. If we are to be carrying on a land war against the rebels and against these two powers, it must be feeble in all its parts, and consequently unsuccessful." [How this sensible opinion came to be abandoned does not appear in the correspondence of the King with Lord North. The decision was probably postponed till the success of the Commissioners, who had been sent with propositions to the colonists, was known. The mission was unsuccessful, and the attempt of Johnstone, one of the Commissioners, to open a clandestine negotiation with some of his private friends in the service of the States, provoked violent and mutual animosity. Full of resentment against Congress, Johnstone came back, with sanguine reports of the distressed state of the American army, of the general dissatisfaction with Congress, and of the disposition of a great part of the people to be reconciled to the mother country. He was most *graciously* received at Court, and much caressed by Ministers.] "I fancy," says Fitzpatrick to his brother (November, 1778), "his advice has determined them to continue the war. This is talked of as an act of necessity, and asserted that America would not make peace without France, having entered into a treaty offensive and defensive with her." [Johnstone, on his arrival, had written to Mr. Fox, with whom he had been on terms of intimacy:] "I have had a letter from Johnstone," says Mr. Fox, in his letter to Fitzpatrick of the 11th of November, "which tallies exactly with the account you gave of his conversation. Whether upon the whole he will do good or mischief, I am not able to judge, but I cannot help retaining the good opinion I used to have of him. I think him very absurd in some of his ideas, but I think his absurdities such as arise from his situation."

*The events of the years 1777 and 1778 ought to have put an end to the American war. A British army had surrendered. Three millions of people at a distance of ten weeks' voyage, in

possession of a great continent, had declared their independence. France, our powerful neighbor, had not only acknowledged that independence, but had concluded a treaty of peace and amity with the United States of America. Lord Chatham, who still clung finally to the connection, had fallen in the field of his glory. To men of expediency, like Lord North and his colleagues, such events would seem to leave but one course open. There was no longer anything to be gained by our arms in America, if her independence was to be acknowledged; a simple cessation of arms must have speedily led to a treaty of peace with the new state. The Opposition, which had caught eagerly at the first overtures of Lord North, would have been silenced by the complete fulfilment of their declared policy.*—J. R.

November 26, Parliament met. "Charles Fox condemned the Address in one of his very best orations. He said it was false, for it called the powers of the Commissioners an Act of Parliament, though Parliament had never seen the commission. Lord North answered Charles Fox but very poorly, and in every debate before Christmas was allowed to have shown no abilities, whether his indolence or his dissatisfaction increased."

"On the report, Charles Fox, a warm friend of General Burgoyne's, had intended to fall heavily on Lord G. Germaine, who happening not to come to the House, Fox turned his artillery against Lord North, and uttered one of the most severe philippics ever pronounced on his accumulation of places, heaped on him in proportion to his miscarriages."

December 4. On Mr. Coke's motion upon Sir Henry Clinton's proclamation—"I think it was in this debate that Lord G. Germaine asserted that *the King was his own Minister*, which Charles Fox took up admirably, lamenting that his Majesty was *his own unadvised Minister*."

December 12. On Temple Lutterell's motion for a court-martial on Pattison, after Keppel had spoken and retired, "Charles Fox, as his relation and friend, said Admiral Keppel would scorn recrimination, and therefore, lest it should have that

look, he would move for the order of the day to supersede it. The order of the day was called for, and the motion dropped."

"Lord Beauchamp (afterwards Marquis of Hertford), a Lord of the Treasury, had told me that he had thoughts of moving to take off double taxes from Roman Catholics. In that respect the Opposition was as forward as the Court. Charles Fox, on the report of the land-tax, before Christmas, had moved for that repeal, but was told that he was too late, as the bill for the land-tax was too far advanced, and that he must wait till another year."

Mr. Fox's liberality to Catholics at this period, whether originally suggested by Burke, or by his own sense of justice and benevolence, is most remarkable. Walpole, who records it, manifestly disapproves, and with the exception of Burke and Sir G. Savile, there were few of the friends of liberty at that time who could distinguish between absolute liberty for religious opinions, and an approbation of those so tolerated.—v. H.

MR. FITZPATRICK TO LORD OSSORY.

"*Saturday*, [*December* 12, 1778.]

"DEAR BROTHER:—

"I am very sorry, as you will be, that you did not come to town, for we had yesterday the most interesting debate I ever remember to have heard. You will see accounts of it in the newspapers. The House was violently disposed to Keppel, who spoke like a man inspired, and no tool was bold enough to venture one word in favor of Palliser. The Admiralty have certainly taken a step that is not defensible, and it can hardly be believed that Lord Sandwich would have been so hasty to order a court-martial if he had not wished ill to Keppel. I saw the Duchess at the opera to-night, and she sees the thing in the proper light. I asked her if she had seen Sandwich, and she said he had not been there yet this year. The court-martial is ordered for the 7th of January. What Opposition will do on this subject is not yet decided, but I think we must have a strong question against the

Admiralty. I think last night we should have carried any question. Palliser's conduct is, to be sure, the most atrocious that ever was heard of. The post is waiting, so adieu.

"R. F."

[The negotiations described in the preceding letters not having come to a successful termination, Lord North, amidst expressions of attachment to the King, appears to have reiterated his former applications for leave to resign; for on the 10th of November, 1778, the King writes to him]:—"On coming home, I found Lord North's box, containing sentiments of affection to my person, although in other respects not very agreeable to my wishes. You cannot be surprised that, surrounded with difficulties, and an opposition to Government, formed of men that, if they could succeed, would restrain no one of the absurdities they have sported, I think the duty, nay, personal honor, of those in public station must prompt them to make every effort to assist me who have unreservedly supported them." [The nature and degree of support expected by his Majesty appear from a subsequent letter (November 14), in which he says]: "If the Ministers, in their speeches, show that they will never consent to the independence of America, and that the assistance of every man will be accepted on that ground, I am certain the cry will be strong in their favor." [In the same letter he complains of Lord North saying that he had not the requisite *authority* for the conduct of affairs at this time.] "The word *authority* puzzles me; for, from the hour of Lord North's so handsomely devoting himself, on the retreat of the Duke of Grafton, I have never had a political thought which I have not communicated unto him, have accepted of persons highly disagreeable to me, because he thought they would be of advantage to his conducting public affairs, and have yielded to measures my own opinion did not quite approve. Therefore, I must desire to have an explanation in writing on what is meant by that word."

1779.

The year commenced with Lord Keppel's trial, at Portsmouth. Lord Rockingham and many of his party took lodgings in the town during the trial.

"Charles Fox, being told by one of the Cavendishes, who had been at Portsmouth, that their friends there were finely warm, replied: 'Then I will go there to see what their warmth is, for I have never seen any in them.'"—H. W.

At this time fresh negotiations seem to have been set on foot. On this subject I find, in the Rockingham correspondence, the following letter:—

HON. CHARLES JAMES FOX TO THE MARQUIS OF ROCKINGHAM.

"*January* 24, 1779.

"My dear Lord:—

"It would be needless in me to remind you of the many conversations that have passed between us last summer and the beginning of the winter, upon the subject of a proposition which I was desired to make to you and others.

"You know how widely we differed in opinion upon that matter; and I am sorry to say that it happened upon this occasion, as upon such occasions is too usual, that the more we discussed the subject, and the more we disputed upon it, the more we became attached to our original opinions. What you considered as a step of the most dangerous tendency to the Whig party, I looked upon as a most favorable opportunity for restoring it to that power and influence which I wish it to have as earnestly as you can do. The very circumstances which you thought likely to render the proposed arrangement weak, I considered as means of strength and stability; because it has always been, and I believe always will be, my opinion that power (whether over a people or a king) obtained by gentle means, by the good-will of the person to be governed, and, above all, by degrees, rather than by a sud-

den exertion of strength, is in its nature more durable and firm, than any advantage that can be obtained by contrary means. I do not say all this in hopes of convincing you, but only in my own justification for entertaining sentiments so opposite to those of the person in the world I most respect. In short, our difference of opinion is quite complete. You think you can best serve the country by continuing in a fruitless opposition; I think it impossible to serve it at all but by coming into power; and go even so far as to think it irreconcilable with the duty of a public man to refuse it, if offered to him in a manner consistent with his private honor, and so as to enable him to form fair hopes of doing essential service. I know there are some people, and perhaps you may be one, who will say that these opinions are the consequences of my particular situation, or at best that I am warped towards them by that situation. All I can say is that I have done all I could do to examine my heart on that question, and do not feel myself at all doubtful upon it. That I have the most extreme eagerness for your friends coming into office is true, because I think their coming in essentially necessary to the making the best possible system, and because I am convinced that if this opportunity be missed another will not offer; but that I am not myself personally over-eager to accept office, I believe I could easily enough prove, if I were so inclined. But I do beg of you, my dear Lord, to consider how very impracticable it is either for me, or for many other parts of the Opposition, to go on together upon the ideas upon which you maintain your refusal. For is it, or is it not, a fair and open declaration that you will never have anything to do with any Ministry that is *not entirely* of your own framing? and do you not, in some instances, rest your refusal upon grounds to which we are so far from pledged, that we are in some instances pledged directly on the contrary side? I do not mention this as a matter of reproach, but only to show you how very impossible it is for anybody, who is not *one of you*, to enter into your ideas and objects of opposition. I dare say you do not think me weak enough to think it possible for me to shake, by any arguments I can bring, systems long since adopted, and in which you are con-

firmed by the concurrent opinions of persons who have, or ought to have, ten thousand times more weight with you than I can pretend to. All that I desire is that you will give me explicit answers to two questions; and this I think I have a right to, from the very open conduct I have always held towards you. The first of these questions is, Whether you persist in the opinion you had of rejecting, if again proposed, the offer formerly made? By rejecting, I mean rejecting in the manner in which you then rejected it; because, if you thought it upon the whole a tolerable basis for an arrangement, you would state particular difficulties and objections, which might be discussed, and possibly removed. If you should persist in rejecting all offers of this sort, my next question is, Supposing an Administration should be formed partly of those who now act in opposition, and partly of the present people (always understanding the most exceptionable to be removed, particularly North, Sandwich, and Germaine), whether you would give such a Ministry any countenance whatever? By *countenance*, I mean whether any of your friends would take employments with such a Ministry, if they were such as were suitable to them in other respects, and the men with whom they had to act, such as they could have no other objection to than that of coming in contrary to your opinion? Perhaps I presume too much upon the confidence in which we have lived for some time past, in asking this second question, which may be thought to be rather of a delicate nature. All I can say is that I will give you my word of honor not to make any rash or improper use of any answer you may make me. If you decline answering it, I shall not complain, but it is a necessary one for me to ask. I am afraid I have been very tiresome to you upon this subject, but I could not answer to myself the not putting to you two questions, the answers to which I think very essential in regulating my future conduct. If you can send your answer by Lord Fitzwilliam, who will give you this, I shall be obliged to you, though there is nothing that presses very much, for I assure you the hypothesis is merely a hypothesis; but the sooner I can have your answer, the more I shall be obliged to you. I will trouble you no more upon this subject; but, surely, if ever there

was a crisis where a country demanded all the efforts of its best men, it is the present; and surely some blame must lie at the doors of those who, from mistrust or suspicion, deprive it of the best assistance it can have.

"Pray make my kindest compliments to Admiral Keppel and the Duke of Richmond. We look upon the court-martial to be the same as over, and heartily wish it was literally so, &c. &c.

"C. J. FOX."

On the 29th of January the King writes to Lord North: "I perceive, as I expected, that Opposition, when they talk of conditions, mean to dictate. I thank God, whatever difficulties may surround me, I am not made of materials to stoop to that." [On the 1st of February, he seems to have prevailed on Lord North to remain at the Treasury.] "I rejoice," says he, "that you'll do what I think best. I do not wish any change at the Treasury; but, that I may not appear too obstinate, I do not object, if Lord North thinks the language held by the Duke of Grafton to Mr. Chamick worthy of consideration, to empower Lord Weymouth to see what can be engrafted on it." [This negotiation soon came to an end, for on the 4th he writes again:] "When Lord Weymouth met the Duke of Grafton last night, he found no reason to ground any hopes that any coalition could be effected. My conduct will show that I never am deaf to any apparent proposals of general union, though no circumstances shall ever compel me to be dictated to by Opposition. You may now sound Lord Howe; but before I name him to preside at the Admiralty Board, I must expect an explicit declaration that he will zealously concur in prosecuting the war *in all the quarters of the globe.*" In other words, the King was willing to employ any one who would concur with him in his efforts to reduce the revolted colonies to obedience; but would not accept the services of Opposition, because the Opposition thought that object unattainable, and were ready to acknowledge the independence of the United States. The result is that it was the King at that period, and the King only,

who prevented a coalition of parties and peace with America.—V. H.

* I cannot concur in this last remark. The King's determination to carry on the war in all quarters of the globe could have had no practical influence, had not Lord North consented to remain Minister, to carry on a war of which he disapproved, and had not a majority of the House of Commons supported a system which they believed in their hearts to be fraught with danger to the country. The power of a single will was indeed conspicuous; but the constitution afforded ample means of overruling that will, had the Minister obeyed his own convictions, or had the House of Commons been true to the people they represented. In October of this year, Lord Gower resigned the Presidency of the Council. "I feel," he said, "the greatest gratitude for the many marks of royal goodness which I have received, but I cannot think it the duty of a faithful servant to endeavor to preserve a system which must end in ruin to his Majesty and to the country." In reporting to the King his vain attempts to induce Lord Gower to remain in office, Lord North[1] adds: "In the argument, Lord North had certainly one disadvantage, which is that he holds in his heart, and has held for three years past, the same opinion with Lord Gower."[2] That is to say, from 1776 Lord North had disapproved, in his heart, the system he had himself pursued!*—J. R.

* The following admirable letter of the Duke of Richmond shows that he had some doubts of the firmness of Mr. Fox in resisting the overtures of the Court. But, although Mr. Fox had no personal objection to Lord North, and was on friendly terms with Lord Weymouth, his real inclination at this time was to connect himself more closely with Mr. Burke and the Rockingham party.*—J. R.

[1] North MS.

[2] See p. 202.

DUKE OF RICHMOND TO MR. FOX.

"Goodwood, *February* 7, 1779.

"Dear Charles :—

"Lord Rockingham and Mr. Burke have shown me the letters you have written to them by Lord Fitzwilliam.[1] As they relate to a transaction in which I was concerned, and to which you seem to require further discussion, I trust you will not be sorry to hear directly from me as well as from them. Indeed, I am very desirous of writing to you on this subject, not to dispute points on which we may never agree, but to set you right on the part which we, to whom you communicated the overtures last summer, took in that business, and which you seem to have misunderstood.

"By the first question you ask, as by the whole tenor and reasoning of your letters, as well as of your former conversations, you seem to imagine that our refusal to treat upon the opening at that time made, arose from a resolution not to take office until the *whole* of the Government was surrendered into our hands, and the King compelled to a kind of submission, which you think is not to be expected, and can never be forced; for when you mention the manner of our refusal to treat upon *the basis of the arrangement proposed*, your arguments all go upon a supposition that the *basis* you speak of is a *coalition* with some of the men now in power in contradistinction to a *total change* of Ministry. Now, as far as I was concerned, I can positively say, and I believe I might answer for others, this was not the ground on which we *rested* that refusal, and therefore you will allow me to say, your reasonings, built on that supposition *alone*, do not apply. Before I state what our refusal *did rest upon*, it will be necessary for me to describe what I conceive the overtures amounted to, what they did offer, and what they were totally silent about.

"The proposal was, that Lord Weymouth should have the Treasury, and Mr. Thurlow be Chancellor; that arrangements

[1] See p. 174 for the letter to Lord Rockingham.

should be made to take into office the principal men in Opposition, and that Lords North, Germaine, Suffolk, Sandwich, Dartmouth, and perhaps some more, might quit their employments to facilitate these arrangements; that Lord Weymouth would be *most glad* to have Lord J. Cavendish for Chancellor of the Exchequer, but would take any other we should agree upon; that Lord Rockingham and his friends might by themselves fill up the vacant offices, or take in the Duke of Grafton, Lords Camden and Shelburne. If the former, there would be more room for providing for friends; if the latter, less. But that at all events some must wait till means could be found to accommodate them; that the basis of the scheme being a coalition, and Lord Weymouth being at the head of the new Ministry, it would follow of course that none of those with whom he had acted (that is, none of the members of the old Ministry) were to be attacked for any part of their conduct; that his Majesty meant not to suffer any of them to be disgraced; that, on the contrary, he intended to bestow on them the three blue ribbons then vacant, and other marks of his favor and approbation to such as should retire.

"As to measures, none were proposed, except to withdraw the troops in general from North America, as from necessity or prudence, and to carry on a vigorous war against France, which was stated as unavoidable. No system was proposed, or even suggested, by which the dependency of America was to be recovered, or its alliance as an independent state procured. No foreign alliances were in contemplation. The management of the East India Company, and the great possessions in India, were never once mentioned. I do not know that there was any inclination, still less any plan, for reducing the corrupt influence of the Crown, and rendering Parliament more independent.

"The dreadful and immediately ruinous state of our finances was never in question; no plan of future resources, or of present reformation and economy, was any part of the overtures you communicated. I do not mean to say that some very slight discourse upon one or two of these points did not pass between you and us, or that you did not show that inclination to act right upon them,

which your conduct for some years past would naturally lead us to expect from you. But as parts of your message, I believe I am correct in stating them as I have done. I might even add that, when we mentioned some past measures we were bound to the public to see changed, you reminded us that parts of Opposition were concerned the other way, and how difficult it would be to agree to anything material in respect to them.

"I may be told that, meaning to make us Ministers, measures were to be in our hands, and would be a more proper subject for discussion when the new arrangement should have actually taken place. If the change of men was to be a *total change*, and the new Ministry, instead of consenting to rewards to those whose conduct they had been condemning for years past, bore the complexion of a new system, there might be some weight in the argument of the propriety of leaving it till they were fixed in office, to determine on the precise mode by which they would support their consistency of character; and yet, even in such circumstances, I should think it more fair and honorable to the King to let him know, before he took us into his service, at least the general plan of measures we meant to pursue, especially as some of them must strike directly at what he may have been told is his interest, and certainly at his Civil List—I mean at its present extent. But in a Ministry to be composed of men who have hitherto professedly differed in principles, as well as in the modes of conducting them, it is surely necessary, unless men look at nothing but employment, to begin by having a right understanding of the conduct to be pursued. If I am told that, without being a total change of men, that which was intended was so great as to leave only a shadow of the present Administration, and that the Opposition would have so great a majority in the Cabinet that they would in fact have the Government in their own hands, I then say that the whole depends upon the share and proportion that is offered them, and that it must be specifically described in all its parts before they can judge whether it is such as really to give them that power which shall enable them to pursue their own measures. For, on the one hand, I am ready to allow that we

ought not to expect the removal of *every* man in office, from the First Lord of the Treasury to the lowest tide-waiter; and on the other, you will allow that we must expect more than the removal of the lowest tide-waiters, or even than one or two obnoxious men, when it is a whole system we complain of. The fair and practicable plan certainly lies between these two extremes, and depends much upon the *quantum* that was offered, and upon the manner and complexion of the whole, whether it is wise or mad to reject it; for I am sure you will agree with me that a very plausible general offer may be made, which, from peculiar circumstances, may be evidently insidious, and which it would nevertheless be very invidious to break off merely on account of those circumstances. Let me suppose, for instance, that those who say they mean to give us effectual power, should stipulate to have in each board and department some one man of apparently inoffensive manners, but who from his connections we could but look upon as a spy, would not such a symptom indicate rottenness? and yet, would it not be difficult, and certainly invidious, to say we broke off precisely because such or such a private gentleman was not turned out of office? Before, therefore, we can possibly judge whether any offer of the nature you was to communicate is such as can enable us to do any real good to the country, we must know precisely either what change of measures is proposed by others, or the detail of that share of Government which is offered to enable us to carry on our plans.

"If I am told that it is difficult for Lord Weymouth to open upon all these subjects, and that, although experience may have convinced him that a change both of measures and of men may be necessary, yet that it would be risking a great deal for him to particularize what measures he would agree to change, and which of his former colleagues he would remove, without previously knowing whether his offers of such change would procure the coalition with Opposition which he wishes—I must in return say, that it would be absurd in us, who have every reason to be confirmed in all our former opinions of measures, to declare that we could relax any of them without a clear prospect of obtaining some great good, to

overbalance small concessions; and that it would be extremely unwise in us to mark out the men we wish to see most advanced or most degraded, until the moment that such changes can take place and produce their effect.

"You may say that mutual confidence is necessary in negotiations, and I agree that it is. The most ready way to show it on the part of Lord Weymouth, if he really intends the management of affairs should be in our hands, would be for him to advise the King to send for Lord Rockingham, and to desire him to form an Administration. Such a step has been twice taken in this reign, and there can be no doubt on the part of Lord Rockingham, that, in the arrangement he would make, Lord Weymouth and his friends would have that share which their conduct in bringing about the change would entitle them to, and this would avoid for Lord Weymouth all the difficulty of his turning out his former friends to make room for ours. But if *we are not to make the arrangement*, and are yet to be supposed *to have the management of affairs*, it becomes surely not only fair but necessary that we should have a specific description of *that share of Government proposed for us*, which is to give us the *means*, *weight*, and *authority* to carry our measures; or if it is not intended that we are to direct the measures, it is necessary we should have a precise idea of those to which we are called to accede. Without one of these it is merely an offer of places without power, under a bargain to screen those whom we have been so long condemning. Such an offer I am sure you will approve of our rejecting with indignation. I am far from being inclined to suspicion, but it is impossible for us to forget that Lord Weymouth has already once abandoned us; and not to recollect that this offer, although said to be warranted by the King, comes to us through a second and third hand. Not suspicion, but prudence requires us to be upon our guard. We cannot judge of the degree of inclination there may be in the King to this change. Lord Weymouth or you, without the least intention to deceive, may not convey that precision of disposition which in such a business is so necessary to be known, and it is very dangerous to commence a negotiation without an absolute certainty of what the

King means. You cannot be ignorant of the very strong reports that, while Lord Weymouth was offering to treat with us upon the ground of removing some of his colleagues, they were making like offers to others! Which of these treaties were authorized, whether both, or neither, we cannot know; but you will allow that, under such circumstances, it is necessary for us to require a very full and authentic explanation before we can return any other answer than that which we gave last summer; a general one, not resting upon any one particular point, but that, *from the complexion of the business, we did not judge it proper to enter any farther into it.* In various respects circumstances are undoubtedly altered since that time, but the general principles upon which any treaty can be opened appear to me to remain exactly the same; and you may recollect that when you again mentioned the subject this winter, I told you that both as to measures and as to arrangements, the offer did not seem to me sufficiently explained; that if Lord Weymouth thought proper to reduce into writing his thoughts upon these points, we could give him a direct answer, Yes or No; and if ever this subject is renewed, I shall again propose having it detailed. Then, to an explicit proposal we can give an explicit answer, a general *no*, if on the whole we see no prospect of its answering our purpose of having weight enough to do good—*yes*, if it comes up to those expectations which we think both reasonable and honest; or if it approaches so near, and with an appearance of real good intentions as to make us think the difference negotiable, I shall in such case be for entering into treaty. I will at the same time consent that, if not agreed to, the paper shall be instantly burnt in your presence, and the contents never communicated but in the vague and uncertain form your communication has hitherto appeared. I really think it has not been possible for us to do otherwise than say, it is not sufficiently opened to enable us to give it any answer.

"I think I have said enough on your first question. As to the second, it is impossible to answer it. How can we tell whether or not to advise our friends to take employment, unless we know what measures are to be carried on? and how can we tell whether

we ourselves can support or must oppose a Ministry, whose very names we are hitherto unacquainted with, and whose actions we cannot guess at? I can only say that if we should again be reduced by desertions to our own party, which has so long and so faithfully acted together, I hope and trust we shall not be dismayed, but still shall persevere in resisting what we think wrong, and in preventing some mischief, if we cannot do much positive good. It is certainly a very dispiriting and tiresome work, but we have been used to it, and receive good comfort from the conviction that it is an honorable line of conduct.

"I have only one more subject to mention, and that is your stating that those who think differently from us, as to entering into this negotiation, may not think themselves justified in refusing to accept of office where they may hope to do some good, or that they are obliged to continue in an opposition which they think fruitless; that although they may wish for a *total* change as the *best thing*, they may not think themselves bound, when they see that impossible, to reject the second best, and leave things at the *worst*. If this reasoning applies to yourself, and, circumstanced as things are, you feel inclined to take employment with the present people (after a few changes are made), I can only say that your conduct must entirely be guided by your own opinions, and I do assure you that I shall not impute your change to any improper desire for the emoluments of office. But as I certainly differ from you as to the wisdom of such a step, I cannot admit that it is real reason which governs you. I must therefore believe your opinions to arise from a mistaken idea that they are right, which I think your want of patience in the present difficult situation, and the natural eagerness of your temper, leads you to believe.

"I can only offer you my opinions, taken not from prejudice, I trust, but from a real anxiety for your welfare, that such a step will be far from being for your interest. I am sure you will pardon the sincerity of so near a relation. You have many of those social virtues which command the love of friends. You have abilities in abundance; and your conduct of late years has done much to regain that public confidence which is so necessary to a

public man. By a steady perseverance you may accomplish so essential an object. Once more pardon the effusion of a sincere heart, and believe me,

"Ever yours,
"RICHMOND."

The negotiation or negotiations above alluded to were far from being so much to Mr. Fox's mind as some expressions of the Duke of Richmond would lead one to suppose. He acquiesced in, and, I believe, approved of the rejection. When I talked of it to General Fitzpatrick, he said that Mr. Fox treated the overture as a foolish business; but it is clear to me that General Fitzpatrick had forgotten or confounded the transaction; for he mentioned some circumstances, such as his ignorance of it at the time, which are inconsistent with his letter to his brother, hereinafter transcribed. It appears, however, from all this, that the union between the regular aristocratical Whig party and Mr. Fox, though they were in effect practically inseparable, was not formally accomplished even so late as February, 1779. The Duke of Richmond writes as to a man with whom he agrees and with whom he concerts, but not as to a fixed member of some party, to and with whom he is engaged by actual treaty.—V. H.

February 11. In the evening news of Keppel's acquittal arrived in London. Illuminations and a riot ensued. Palliser's, Hoad's, and Mulgrave's windows were broken, and those of some other persons. "It happened at three in the morning, that Charles Fox, Lord Derby, and his brother, Major Stanley, and two or three more young men of quality, having been drinking at Almack's, suddenly thought of making a tour of the streets, and were joined by the Duke of Ancaster, who was very drunk, and, what showed it was no premeditated scheme, the latter was a courtier, and had actually been breaking windows. Finding the mob before Palliser's house, some of the young lords said: 'Why don't you break Lord G. Germaine's windows?' The populace had been so little tutored that they asked who he was, and being encouraged

broke his windows. The mischief pleasing the juvenile leaders, they marched to the Admiralty, forced the gates, and demolished Palliser's and Lord Lisburne's windows. Lord Sandwich, exceedingly terrified, escaped through the garden, with his mistress, Miss Ray, to the Horse Guards, and there betrayed most manifest panic."[1]

February 12. "Keppel thanked by House of Commons, with only one dissentient voice."

February 18. "Wedderburne, Attorney-General, having undertaken to prosecute the three rioters, notice was taken of it in the House of Commons, and Charles Fox handsomely and generously, though liable to be reproached with having been one of their instigators, pleaded for them. The court was ashamed, and dropped the prosecution."

February 19. "Charles Fox told the Commons that he had intended to move an Address to the King, to remove Sir H. Palliser from all his employments, but had that morning heard a report that precluded his motion, for he had been told that Sir Hugh had been dismissed or removed from all his employments, and asked if either was true. Lord North said: 'It was true that he had resigned his seat at the Admiralty, his Government at Scarborough Castle, and his Lieutenant-Generalship of the Marines.' Fox broke out on the scandalous tenderness for a man so criminal, compared with the treatment of the meritorious Keppel, to whom the Ministers had only written coldly to hoist his flag again. He said he did not want to persecute the unhappy man, nor saw what good a court-martial could do him, for it could not clear him from having brought a malicious and unjust charge against Keppel, which disqualified him from ever serving as Vice-Admiral, and, therefore, he had a mind to move for taking that rank from him. He might still have a court-martial, as Lord G. Germaine had had (after some objections to prejudging, in which

[1] It was always said that the late Mr. Thomas Grenville participated in this riot at the Admiralty. But these were lawless days!—J. R.

Conway agreed). Charles Fox, in compliment to Conway, abstained from his motion."[1]

February 20. On Keppel dining at London Tavern, "the city was again illuminated, and it spread to Westminster after midnight, when the mob was far more riotous than the preceding night, and far more windows were broken; but it was believed to be at the instigation of the Court, to make the Opposition sick of such rejoicings; for many windows of the Opposition were broken, particularly Charles Fox's."

February 24. On Lord North's Budget, "Charles Fox, who had never applied to finance, nor was supposed to understand it at all, entered into the subject, and made as great a figure as he did on all others, and exposed Lord North in that light as much as he had in others."

RICHARD FITZPATRICK TO LORD OSSORY.

"*February* 15, 1779.

"DEAR BROTHER :—

"According to your desire to give you an account of what has passed, the message that was received on Sunday was, that the person [*the King*] desired till morning to consider of it, and this morning he sent word by the negotiator [Lord Weymouth] that any *coalition* would be agreed to, but that the main object [the Treasury] could not be granted; so that, as things appear at present, the negotiation must break off, which the person who brought the message expressed great concern for. This being the case, Charles Fox desires me to tell you that they mean to proceed immediately in the most hostile manner. I don't know what we

[1] I remember Mr. Fox telling me that, at the close of the debate, young Pitt (afterwards the Minister) lamented to him that he did not persist in his motion, as he (Pitt) feared enough had not been done to prevent Palliser from ever being employed or promoted. Pitt afterwards gave him, if I mistake not, Greenwich Hospital, and had, I suspect, some difficulty in resisting the King's urgent instances to name him to the Channel Fleet.—V. H.

shall have to-morrow in the House of Commons; in the Lords, the thanks to Keppel are to be moved. I take it for granted you will come on Wednesday, and will probably find something going on in the House of Commons. I don't know whether the mysterious language at the beginning of this letter will be clear enough, but I think you will guess the import of it. In short, I am afraid all chance of the present opportunity is at an end. Adieu."

[On the debates produced by the Spanish Manifesto, the two following letters, in both of which Mr. Fox is mentioned, were written by Mr. Fitzpatrick to his brother Lord Ossory]:—

MR. FITZPATRICK TO LORD OSSORY.

"*Saturday, June* 19, 1779.

"The event of the Spanish declaration has hitherto produced nothing but a very general consternation, and a most universal acknowledgment of the necessity of changing the Ministry, which most people think must take place, though, in point of voting, the numbers were much as usual in both Houses. Some violent people thought the conduct of Opposition too moderate upon the occasion, but I think you will approve of it; for it surely would have been an unpopular measure to have refused their support upon the present occasion. Lord John Cavendish seconded the Address, and he, with Charles, Burke, &c., went to St. James's with it. The two latter spoke admirably in the debate, and so, indeed, the first. The Duke of Richmond distinguished himself very much in the House of Lords, and met with approbation from all quarters. Lord Shelburne (which some people thought was done purposely) seemed determined to be as violent as the other was moderate, and pronounced a most furious philippic, in the coarsest terms, against the Ministers, chiefly North, Sandwich, and Germaine. Our friend Carlisle attempted the defence of the latter in a short speech.

"I was in the House, and heard these two speeches. It is still

said that Parliament will be prorogued on Monday or Tuesday. The Spanish fleet has sailed; twelve ships from Cadiz, the 27th of May, and twenty more on the 3d of June. Add these to M. D'Orvilliers's, and you will be surprised to hear the Lord Advocate has said that he wished to hear Sir Charles Hardy was to engage them the morrow. All people see the necessity of withdrawing the troops from America. None of the Tories in town stayed out the debate the other night, except Baldwyn, who voted with us, and declared himself *sick* of America. One can hardly conceive but they will make some attempt this summer either here or in Ireland, and if our fleet is beat, it will probably be a very serious one."

"*Monday night.*

"I fancy by this night's post you will receive a letter upon the subject you mention, which will bring you to London, and which will inform you of an event we have expected, and which I think a very good one. I went this morning to Lord Shelburne's, but did not find him. I am glad to find your politics agree so exactly with mine, for though I told you I thought the supporting the Address was wise, I approved much more of the violence of Lord Shelburne's speech than the moderation of the Duke of Richmond's, which I have been inveighing against ever since. To-day, however, we have had a debate, in which Opposition have been less moderate; Lord North moved a bill to double the militia, which was seconded by Lord Beauchamp. What may not be hoped from the activity of Lord North and the vigor of Lord Beauchamp? Charles spoke in favor of the motion, but strongly against Ministers, and showed what resources his mind was capable of in this menacing crisis. Tommy Townshend spoke well and very violently, so did Sir G. Savile and Barré, and the Ministers seemed really totally sunk. To-morrow, a remonstrance is expected from the city. An invasion either of England or Ireland must take place, and surely it is impossible these Ministers should remain. Adieu. I suppose I shall see you to-morrow or next day."

"P. S.—G. Selwyn is just arrived from Paris, but seems not to have the least idea of anything that is going forward. Johnstone voted with us, and Mansfield not at all; the Duke of Portland and Lord Chatham voted in Opposition, but did not protest. Lord Derby, the Duke of Rutland, Lord Harrington, have offered to raise regiments, but have received no positive answers to their proposals."

[In the following autumn, the combined fleets of France and Spain entered the chops of the Channel, and paraded for several days before Plymouth. Of their first appearance off the Lizard, Mr. Fox sent the following account to Lord Ossory]:—

London, *April* 17.

"Dear Ossory:—

"The French and Spanish fleets are certainly off Lizard Point, and between Sir Charles Hardy and Plymouth. You may depend on this being true; sixty-three were seen; but whether there were more or not, or how many of them were frigates, is not certain. There must be a battle, and Sir Charles Hardy has but thirty-six.

"Yours ever,

"C. J. FOX."

[Happening to be at Plymouth a few days afterwards, when the combined squadrons threatened to make a second appearance in the Channel, he sent to Mr. Fitzpatrick the following particulars of this mortifying state of things, to which nothing since the days of Elizabeth had been parallel]:—

MR. FOX TO MR. FITZPATRICK.

"Saltram, *August* 26, *at night.*

"Dear Dick:—

"Lord Hervey and Pakenham, who anchored last night in Cawsand Bay, brought an account that Darby was gone up the Channel, and that the combined fleets were steering this way.

This morning, Lord Shuldham and the Commissioner have received letters from Darby, telling them that he is gone into Torbay, and that he had heard of the combined fleet in lat. 47°, long. 10°, sailing to the N. E., with about forty sail of the line. From what Lord Hervey and Pakenham said last night, everybody expected the enemy here immediately, and many people imagined that Darby had seen the combined fleet, and was actually chased in by them; but, upon inquiry, this does not seem to have been the case at all. All that Darby knows of the enemy is from an account of a Portuguese vessel, who says that he spoke with the combined fleet, in the latitude I mentioned, on Tuesday se'n-night last; Darby, upon hearing they were gone to the northward, kept close to the French coast, and came by Guernsey, &c., to Torbay, and, as I could collect from his letter, which Lord Shuldham read us, was a good deal surprised that the enemy should not have been seen or heard of here. You have now all the facts that we have, and may reason upon them as well in London as we can here. What seems extraordinary is, that the enemy, if he was actually so near as the latitude and longitude mentioned on Tuesday, the 14th, should not be near enough to be seen or heard of before this time, if the Channel was actually his destination; and yet what other destination he could have northward, one cannot conceive. I forgot to mention, that though the number of ships of the line is said to be between forty and fifty, the whole fleet is said to consist of ninety sail. I shall go to Torbay to-morrow, and see if I can get any more light upon this business from Jarvis, or any of the captains I know. If I do, I will write again. If I should think, from what I hear, that there is really any chance of their coming, you will easily imagine that I shall not leave this country so soon as I otherwise intended; but I think, if they do not appear very soon, the whole must be a mistake, or perhaps, after all, designedly false intelligence. I shall be in town on Friday or Saturday, unless there is a probability of more interesting sport here than partridge-shooting.

"Yours affectionately."

MR. FOX TO MR. FITZPATRICK.

"SALTRAM, *August* 27.

"I dined to-day on board 'Sir John Ross,' with Jarvis and others, but have very little to tell you in addition to what I wrote last night. The facts were exactly as I told you them, only I understand now that the Portuguese vessel was in fact an English one, with Portuguese colors and nominal owners, to secure it from privateers, and that the master of her was an Englishman; his journal, too, was inspected, and tallied with the account he gave. In short, I find they all believe his intelligence to have been true. But why the combined fleet is not now here, if it was coming this way, is what nobody seems to account for; Jarvis thinks they are gone into Quiberon Bay, in order to see the Dutch Indiamen, which they had with them, safe into Port l'Orient, and to bring the troops with them that they may want for attacking the Isle of Wight, Portland, or whatever may be their object. Others think (and I think with more probability) that they are cruizing off the Lizard, in hopes of intercepting Darby, whom they suppose to be to the westward, and whom they must naturally expect to come home that way, as he certainly would have done if he had not obtained intelligence of them. The only objection to this supposition is, that they could not have formed any rational hope of bringing Darby to action against his will, as the Spanish part of the fleet is said to be very foul; so that Darby could certainly (as they say) have got home without an engagement, even if he had come that way. I think it a very difficult matter to guess what they mean; but one should think it impossible that with such a decided superiority they should attempt nothing. Darby waits at Torbay for orders, which he expects to-morrow or next day. I shall dine on board Jarvis, Wednesday, and from thence proceed to London or return here, according as, upon the general face of things, I think anything likely to happen here. The fleet to-day was a most magnificent sight. It was formed in order that, in case of an attack, they may not be found in the confusion that

Johnstone was; and faith, when one looks at it and thinks there is a possibility of its coming to action in a day or two, *on se sent ému beaucoup.* If some things were otherwise at home, and the fleet was commanded by Keppel, one should feel very eager indeed; when, even in the present damned state of things, who cannot help feeling something at the sight of it? It seems to be the opinion that, if they do come, Darby will make some sort of fight with them in the narrow part of the Channel. At all events, if the French should come again, I cannot think they will go away as they did before, and that there must, either at sea or land, be *quelque chose à voir;* in which case I should be very much vexed indeed, to have left this country just before the sight begins. Adieu.

"Yours ever most affectionately,

"C. J. FOX.

"By Zoutman's account I perceive the Dutch were rather inferior than superior to Parker. When one considers that there was hardly an officer on board their fleet that ever saw a gun fired, *il faut avouer que ce ne sont pas des plates gens.*"

MR. FOX TO MR. FITZPATRICK.

"SALTRAM, *August* 28.

"There has been a strong south-west wind all day, but no news nor even report at Plymouth. I go to-morrow to Torbay, and probably on to London.

"Yours ever affectionately."

Soon after this alarm, he appears to have credited a report that Ministers had determined to resign, for on the 5th of September he writes to Fitzpatrick: "I really think there is now a possibility of saving the country, if these foolish people will give up the thing to those who know better. Between this and next campaign there is time for increasing the navy incredibly, or for, what would be much better, making a peace which we should dare to do, and these poor devils dare not." But whatever was

the ground for those expectations, they were quickly dissipated. On the appearance of an extraordinary Gazette, announcing the destruction of the American squadron on the Penobscot, he writes as follows:—

"HUNTSTANTON, *September* 27.

"DEAR DICK:—

"If one really wished nothing but the destruction of those we hate, the extraordinary Gazette we have just received would be very good news; for I think nothing more likely than that this event may give them spirits to persevere in the war, which I cannot help thinking they had determined to give up. What a puppy that Sir George Collier must be! Are not the Americans thought to have behaved very ill; or was Sir George's force more superior than he represents it? If this should encourage them to persist, I think it makes their ruin quite sure, and perhaps, in the end, as complete as even you or I can wish; but then everything else will be so bad that it is impossible to wish it. I have just been reading the *Noailles Memoirs*, and when one thinks of what this country was then and is now, it is enough to make one sick. How ruinous everything done by Tories is always destined to be! for I think it cannot be denied but we feel the mischief of the peace of Utrecht even now.

"Yours affectionately,

"C. J. FOX."

[Lord North's application to retire, and the King's unwillingness to accept his resignation, continued throughout the summer. At one time, Lord North appears to have suggested Lord Gower as his successor; for on the 22d of June the King writes to him]: "It is no compliment when I say that Lord Gower would be a poor substitute for Lord North. What I said yesterday was the dictates of frequent and severe self-examination. I can never depart from it. Before I will hear of any man's readiness to come into office, I will expect to see it signed under his own hand that he is resolved to keep the Empire entire, and that no troops shall

consequently be withdrawn from thence, nor independence ever allowed."

[In the beginning of winter, Lord North, being still solicitous to retire, and Lord Thurlow, Lord Gower (who had come to town in September), and Lord Weymouth, concurring in opinion that the Ministry could not carry on the public business without an accession of strength, the King, after another ineffectual effort to work on the feelings of Lord North (November 30, 1779), was prevailed upon to give authority to Lord Thurlow to open a negotiation with the leaders of Opposition,[1] and to declare to them his Majesty's willingness] "to blot from his remembrance any events that may have displeased him, and to admit into his confidence and service any men of public spirit and talents who will join with part of the present Ministry in forming one on a more enlarged scale, provided it be understood that *every means are to be employed to keep the Empire entire*, to prosecute the present just and unprovoked war in all its branches, with the utmost vigor, and that his Majesty's past measures be treated with proper respect." [In a subsequent communication,[2] Lord Thurlow is authorized to inform the person with whom he had conversed] "that Lord North's situation will not stand in the way of any arrangement, and that he does not desire to be a part of any new administration. 'This,' adds the King, 'ought to convince that person that I really mean a coalition of parties, and not to draw him in to support the present Ministry.'"

[Furnished with this authority, Lord Thurlow seems to have proceeded in a strange way to execute his commission. Instead of using the King's name, he] "conversed with Lord Camden, Lord Shelburne, and others, but still as a private man, disclaiming all authority to make proposals. 'They declined,' he says, in his report of what had passed, to the King, 'to enter into that sort of conversation with me on that footing, but they never imagined that they were returning an answer to your Majesty.'"

[The King, on his part, was offended by the "cold and distant"

[1] December 3, 1776.

[2] December 8, 1779.

manner in which Lord Thurlow's overtures had been received, and when no other answer could be obtained than that "a coalition seemed not to suit their views," he observes,[1] with a warmth which Lord Thurlow's subsequent explanation[2] does not appear to have allayed]: "From the cold disdain with which I am treated, it is evident to me what treatment I am to expect from Opposition, if I was to call them into my service. To obtain their support, I must deliver up my person, my principles, and my dominions into their hands." [The truth seems to have been that the King was unwilling to part with Lord North, whom he could govern, and unwilling to put himself in the power of Opposition, who would have insisted on governing him.]

[The spirit in which the Opposition were disposed to receive these overtures appears from the following letter of Mr. Fitzpatrick to his brother, Lord Ossory. It was impossible, indeed, for them to listen to conditions which were at variance with the opinion they entertained of the impolicy of continuing the contest for reducing the revolted colonies to obedience. They must have regarded the proposals made to them to be insincere, as intended not to procure their assistance, but to reconcile Lord North to his situation, by the impossibility of his quitting it without abandoning the King to those whom his Majesty was pleased to consider as his enemies.]

MR. FITZPATRICK TO LORD OSSORY.

"*Thursday night, December* 2, 1779.

"The debate yesterday in the House of Lords was the best I ever remember to have heard. By coming late, I lost the first half of Lord Shelburne's speech; but what I heard I thought excellent, very violent, and very personal to the King: in short, a counterpart of Charles in the House of Commons; and to-day he told me he meant it as such. Many compliments in it to the Rockinghams, which were answered on their side, and the Duke

[1] December 18, 1779. [2] December 26, 1779.

of Richmond equalled him in violence. Lord Gower spoke in the most hostile manner to Administration, though he voted against the motion, upon the grounds of the neglects not being proved sufficiently to justify or censure, though he said he knew them from opportunities which he as a Minister had had, but which the House were not in possession of. He was personal to Lord North upon the subject of negligence, and added that he was clearly of opinion that this Administration were unequal to the conduct of the war, and could not save the country, which he thought union could only effect. The idea of union with any of the present Ministers was universally rejected from every quarter of Opposition, and Lord Camden spoke admirably upon that subject. The Chancellor was the only tolerable speaker on their side, and he defended it only upon the ground of its not being sufficiently proved to proceed to a censure. Upon the whole, it was a very good day in all respects, except numbers, which were as usual. Lord Shelburne seemed much pleased to-day, and told me he thought the appearance of union in Opposition gave him more hopes than anything he had yet seen. He was very severe upon Lord Mansfield (but he was not there) and Wedderburne, and his speech was really one of the finest I ever heard. The post is going out, and I can say no more. Charles is quite well."

On the 29th of November the duel between Mr. Fox and Mr. Adam took place. It is a subject upon which we should expect Horace Walpole to expatiate, but from this very date the entries are not in his own handwriting. They are full of gross blunders in orthography, and evidently written by some ignorant person from Walpole's dictation.

1780.

February 2. "Meeting for a petition in Westminster Hall. The Court party dispersed handbills to represent the dearness of coals, and thence to excite the people against the Duke of Richmond as enriched by the coal-tax. About 3000 persons met,

headed by Duke of Portland, the Cavendishes, Charles Fox, Richard Fitzpatrick, Wilkes, Sawbridge, Lord Temple, and the Grenvilles, General Burgoyne, Burke, Townshends, &c. Charles Fox was placed in the chair. Sawbridge moved the petition, and was seconded by Wilkes; and a petition similar to that of York voted, and a committee of Lords and others chosen. Charles Fox then made a fine and warm speech, and was particularly severe on Lord North and the Duke of Northumberland. Dr. Jebb proposed Mr. Fox for the future candidate for Westminster, which was received with universal applause. Lord J. Cavendish and Charles Turner likewise spoke."

"It was curious to see Charles Fox, lately so unpopular a character, become the idol of the people. His family[1] were still in possession of 200,000*l.* of public money, his father's accounts not being yet passed."

February 8. "Sir G. Savile, in presenting the Yorkshire petition, used many threats of the resentment of petitioners. Lord North turned the argument artfully, and said he found the Parliament was to be threatened, and not allowed even to inquire whether there were abuses or not. Charles Fox finely and wisely explained away Sir G. Savile's violence,[2] and used an allusion, much admired, to the wisdom of Solomon. The ruin of the nation

[1] Horace Walpole knew, or at least should have known, for his family had been frequently in a similar situation, that the delay of passing public accounts was not in those days at all the fault of the Accountant or his representatives, but of the system generally, and sometimes of the public offices and Treasury.—V. H.

[2] Mr. Fox had a great esteem for Sir George Savile, and a great admiration of his subtlety in argument and his fancy in illustration. He was particularly struck with a homely but forcible illustration of the injustice of making war on a nation for any commercial regulations or exclusions: "Sir," said Sir George, "I have no right to knock a man down because he won't buy my leather breeches." I remember, when a boy, asking Mr. Fox, who had been the best speaker in his time who had never held or aspired to office. "Sir George Savile," answered he, "and Mr. Windham." It was then thought that Windham would not take office, though he had, by the by, once accepted it.—V. H.

had been laid to the Opposition, but now it would be seen who was the real mother of the child."

February 14. On petitions for retrenchment and reform. "Charles Fox congratulated Lord North ironically on his being grown so moderate, and was very severe on Lord Hillsborough. Colonel Onslow violent against Duke of Richmond, particularly for surveying the ground in Sussex, and for what the Duc d'Aguillon had said to him. The Duke was defended by General Conway and Charles Fox, who laughed at Onslow's being alarmed at one of the King's generals surveying the coast."

February 29. "Mr. Charles Fox and Mr. Wyvil almost quarrelled on the latter insisting that no members of Parliament should be on the deputation of the committees of petitions. At last it was compromised that it should not be specified as a condition, but that none should be sent."

March 8. On Rigby questioning the right of Commons to inquire into the Civil List, "Fox, Burke, Conway, and others would not allow that the right of the House could be doubted; and declared, if denied, they would appeal to the people."

March 13. A memorable day. Board of Trade voted useless by 207 to 199, and an episode no less remarkable [Rigby having, in defence of himself, against a Sir Edward Deering, repeated his doctrine of the 6th]. "Charles Fox protested against so unparliamentary a declaration, and said he would appeal to the highest authority, the Speaker. This was probably in concert, or at least Sir Fletcher had declaimed against Rigby's doctrine to Fox, for on this appeal the Speaker came down from the gallery, and made a warm and good speech against the increased influence of the Crown, and in favor of the petitions, though he condemned the associations."

March 13. On question of Board of Trade, Charles Fox was very severe on Gibbon, who was brought down in a fit of the gout to vote, as did all the board in their own cause, except Soame Jenyns, who retired.

March 17. Associations move two resolutions, one for "a more equal, and consequently new mode of representation," the

other for frequent, and, at first, for triennial parliaments. "Lord Shelburne was against that, and Charles Fox spoke against it at the Westminster Committee, but it is likely that the committees will be even for annual parliaments."

March 21. On Fullarton's attacking and naming Lord Shelburne, "he was called to order by Charles Fox, for naming persons, and for referring to debates of another House. Mr. Rigby said he was surprised to hear Mr. Fox make those objections, who was so apt to do the same, and had named Lord Hillsborough for what he had said in the other House."

March 24. On notice being taken of Fullarton's duel with Lord Shelburne, and Rigby's deprecating the introduction of names into debates, "Fox declared warmly that he would not be precluded from the freedom of debate, and that when the Extraordinaries of the army should come on, he should name Mr. Fullarton if he found it necessary."

The correspondence of the King at this time evinces the same desire of Lord North to retire, and the same resolute will of the King to continue the American war, and to maintain Lord North in office, as the most convenient tool for that purpose. Thus, on the 7th of March, 1780, the King writes to Lord North: "I can never suppose this country so lost to all ideas of self-importance as to be willing to grant American independence. If that word be ever universally adopted, I shall despair of this country being preserved from a state of inferiority. I hope never to see that day, for, however I am treated, I must love this country." [On the 19th of May, on some fresh expression from Lord North of his desire to be released from office, he says:] "You cannot be surprised at my real sorrow in seeing you persist in the idea that your health will not permit you to remain in your present situation. Had I the power of oratory, or the pen of an Addison, I could say no more than what I can convey in the few following lines: viz., that I am conscious, if you will resolve with spirit to continue in your present employment, that with the assistance of a new Parliament I shall be able to keep the present constitution in its pristine lustre—that there is no means of letting you retire

from taking the lead that will not probably end in evil, and, therefore, till I see things change to a more favorable situation, I shall not think myself at liberty to grant your request. You must be the judge whether you can honorably desert me when infallible ruin must ensue."

[What was the infallible ruin the King apprehended? The independence of America. What was the Ministry he was so anxious to maintain? Hear the description of it given by one of its members, Lord Gower, in a conversation with Lord North, by him communicated to the King, and corroborated by his own admission of the truth of the description]: "Lord Gower came to Lord North to inform him that he had long felt the utmost uneasiness at the situation of his Majesty's affairs; that nothing can be so weak as the Government; that nothing is done; that there was no discipline in the state, the army, or the navy; and that impending ruin must be the consequence of the present system of government; that he thought himself obliged, as well in conscience as in wisdom, to desire an immediate dismissal from his employment; that he had no connection with any of the members of the Opposition, which he thought as wicked as the Administration is weak; that nothing can afford the least hope but a coalition, and he is afraid that even that remedy may be too late; that he feels the greatest gratitude for the many marks of royal goodness which he has received, but that he does not think it the duty of a faithful servant to endeavor to preserve a system which must end in the ruin of his Majesty and of the country. He is determined never again to take office, but to support Government in his private capacity. Lord North thinks that Lord Gower's resignation at the present moment must be the ruin of Administration. In Lord North's arguments with Lord Gower, Lord North owns that he had certainly one disadvantage, which is, that he holds in his heart, and has held for these three years, just the same opinion with Lord Gower." [What were the redeeming qualities that not only reconciled the King to an Administration so weak and inefficient, but made him strain every nerve to retain them in office? They acquiesced in his will, and supported him in his determina-

tion to continue the war with America till the revolted colonies were reduced again to obedience. We must lament the weakness while we enter into the chivalrous feelings of Lord North, which induced him, in opposition to his better judgment, not to abandon a master who expressed for him such confidence, affection, and regard.] *I must again disagree from the opinions of Lord Holland and Mr. Allen. The King held that the acknowledgment of the independence of America would place this country in a state of inferiority, and be tantamount to its ruin as a great and powerful state. Lord Chatham had held an opinion very similar to this. Lord Shelburne, following his leader, said in the House of Lords, that when America became independent, the sun of England would set. The Sovereign was only blamable for the obstinacy with which he clung to an opinion entertained by some of the most sagacious and eminent of his subjects. Lord North's position was different; he was disposed to conciliate America, had sent commissioners for that purpose, and was quite ready to consent to peace. For three years he had been of opinion that his own Ministry was feeble, and would effect no good purpose. Why, then, did he remain? To carry into effect the personal wishes of the Sovereign, which he preferred to the welfare of the state. This may be Toryism, but it is not patriotic; still less is it constitutional conduct.*—J. R.

April 5. "Another very memorable day. In the morning, Charles Fox harangued the petitioners of Westminster in the hall, and was exceedingly severe on the King and the present reign, and declared loudly for annual parliaments and the additional 100 knights, which were eagerly adopted by the assembly. The Court had expected that Fox would be attended to the House by a great mob, and the Guards were ordered to be in readiness, but he went privately as usual, and there was not the least tumult."

"In Committee of Commons, Dunning opened the debate by a motion, 'That the *Influence of the Crown has increased, is increasing, and ought to be diminished.*' The ministers were greatly embarrassed, and had no subterfuge but their old hackneyed evasion, which could only serve in times when they were para-

mount, the 'previous question,' which not being admitted in a Committee (for no earthly good reason), they recurred to its tantamount, of the chairman's leaving the chair, too notoriously implying they did not mean to comply with the petitioners. But this was not a moment to endure such poor shifts."

"The Ministry, like the Jesuits, seemed to have lost their understandings when they had most occasion for them, and Lord North, supported only by his Scotch champions, Wedderburne and the Lord Advocate [Dundas], was not able to contest such numerous and violent attacks. The Lord Advocate at last produced a paltry palliative, by adding to the question, '*It is now necessary to declare that the influence,*' &c., to which he said he meant to give his negative, but instead of dividing on whether these words should stand part of the question, as Dundas expected would be the case, Charles Fox said he had no objection to the words, and they being admitted, Dunning's motion, after a very hot debate, was carried at midnight by 233 to 251."

On another motion of Thomas Pitt, that "it was the duty of the House to procure immediate redress to the grievances mentioned in the petitions, Charles Fox, then so late and though very unusual, moved to report the motions directly to the House; Lord North exclaimed loudly against such proceedings as violent, arbitrary, and unusual."

April 24. A motion of Dunning's against dissolution or prorogation was lost by 254 to 203, "most of the Tories, who had deserted to the Opposition, returning to vote with the Court, particularly Sir Roger Newdigate, who had owned he hated the Opposition, but preferred knaves to fools. Charles Fox abused them after the division, and said the House had broken its promise to the petitioners, and it would be better to secede; but his friend Dunning would try one question more."

April 28. "In one of these debates, Lord G. Gordon took notice that the rejection of Contractors' bill had made no impression. It was very true. Charles Fox had been at Newmarket instead of applying to it, and the country took no notice of it."

May 6. "General Conway moved for a 'bill for pacifying

America.' Opposition only part for it. Hartley and Sir G. Savile preferred a plan for recalling troops. Charles Fox supported Conway warmly; Lord G. Germaine and Lord North opposed him. Eden moved previous question, and it was carried by 123 to 61. Conway was very severe on the bench of Bishops for dipping so deep in blood, and Charles Fox much more so."

May 8. "Sawbridge moved for triennial parliaments; Burke peclared strongly against them, and said he desired his constituents should know his opinion; Fox for them—rejected by 182 to 90; great dissensions at this time on that question between Lord Shelburne and Burke.

May 26. "Mr. Dunning moved for a report from the committee of April 6, which had never been made. Rigby attacked Charles Fox—said when the petitions had been reported at the several assizes, he supposed the country gentlemen had told their constituents they must choose between Lord North and Charles Fox, and they had preferred the former, and that the next Parliament would be still more for the Court than the present. However, he was not tender to Lord North, particularly on the American war, which he said he knew from being Paymaster could not be carried on. Charles Fox told him that if he was in Lord North's place he should not be much obliged to him for such support."

In the beginning of June there is an account of Lord G. Gordon's riots, in the course of which there is no mention of Mr. Fox in Walpole's journal.

June 20. "In the Commons, resolutions that all the penal laws against Papists not repealed were in full force. Sir G. Savile promised a bill against their educating Protestants in their schools, and did bring it in. Burke spoke well but too passionately against repeal; attacked the dissenters, but said the worthiest Presbyterians had not signed the petition, declared *he himself had been brought up by an Anabaptist teacher.* Charles Fox made one of his finest speeches against a repeal, only Sir Joseph Mawbey gave a negative to the resolutions as they were meant in lieu of a repeal."

[The disgraceful riots in June, 1780, by the general panic they diffused, gave strength to the Government, and Lord North seems to have availed himself of the occasion to make fresh overtures to Lord Rockingham through Mr. Frederick Montague. Two accounts of this negotiation have been preserved, the one among Lord North's papers, the other in a letter from Col. Fitzpatrick to his brother, Lord Ossory.]

[A memorandum among Lord North's papers entitled "Minutes of Conversation with Mr. Montague" seems to contain the hints or instructions given to that gentleman before he commenced his negotiation.] "No difficulty about Dukes of Portland and Manchester, Mr. Townshend, Mr. Burke, and Mr. Fox, but Lord —— advises that Mr. Fox should at first be proposed for an office that would not lead immediately to the closet. Some parts of the Duke of Richmond's conduct, which his Majesty thinks meant as personal affronts, would occasion some small difficulty with respect to his grace, and the prejudice must be removed by the duke's conduct before he can be proposed for any considerable office."

[The propositions of Opposition, as understood by Mr. Montague, were:]

1st. The American war requires no discussion, as they did not see how the troops could be recalled from thence, and the dependence of America need not at present be taken into consideration.

2dly. That some public measures must be admitted, to enable them to coalesce with reputation, such as Mr. Crewes's Bill, the Contractors' Bill, and a part, if not the whole, of Mr. Burke's Bill.

3dly. Lord Rockingham did not want office; to offer the Duke of Richmond; and Mr. Fox, to be considered on this occasion.

4thly. The Dukes of Portland and Manchester, Messrs. Townshend and Burke.

5thly. No objection to any one remaining in office, but Lord Sandwich.

[The remarks made by the King on these propositions most probably put an end to the negotiation.] "The evasive answer about America will by no means answer. Indeed, upon all con-

stitutional points, the Opposition have run so wild, that it is absolutely necessary for those who come into office to give assurances that they do not mean to be hampered by the tenants they have held during their opposition. The second proposition is, therefore, quite *inadmissible.*

"The Duke of Richmond and Mr. Fox have, more avowedly than any others of the Rockingham party, dipped themselves, for they have added, shortening the duration of Parliaments; and the former, by a strange conceit of changing the whole mode and right of election, would materially alter the constitution. This, added to his unremitted personal ill conduct to me, it cannot be expected that I should express any wish of seeing him in my service. Persons must atone for their faults before I can attempt to forgive them. The Duke of Richmond has not put his foot into my apartments for *seven* years, but, not content with this, sent me a message by Lord Weymouth, that though he never came near to me, he, as a Lieutenant-General, asked my leave to go to France. As to Mr. Fox, if any lucrative, not ministerial office, can be pointed out for him, provided he will support the Ministry, I shall have no objection to the proposition. He never had any principle, and can, therefore, act as his interest may guide him.

"The Duke of Portland I should *with pleasure* see in my service. Ireland, or any great Court office, would, I hope, suit him. The Duke of Manchester, in a lucrative office, I should not object to. Messrs. Townshend and Burke would be real acquisitions."

These extracts, from Lord North's papers and correspondence, prove the obstinacy and pride of George III., and show how incapable he was of appreciating the character or respecting the feelings of superior or independent men; but they raise another inference, and one more important to the vindication of Mr. Fox's subsequent conduct. They show that, between the respective leaders of the two parties, and especially between Lord North and the Opposition party, there was little diversity of principle or opinion, and much less personal estrangement or animosity, than the occasional heat of debate seemed to imply. As early as 1778, and up to 1780, several negotiations, or half negotiations, occurred.

From the documents, which substantiate the truth of them, it is clear that Lord North lamented, as much as his opponents censured, the obstinate perseverance in the American war, and that he equally lamented, and frequently, though unsuccessfully, endeavored to overcome the aversion of the King to admit the advocates of peace, reform, or any popular measures into his councils. It follows there was no dereliction of principle in men equally disposed, though by different means, to combat and control the will of one man prevailing over common sense, prudence, and justice, ultimately coalescing for that purpose.—V. H.

The letter of Colonel Fitzpatrick shows the light in which this last overture was viewed by him and his friends.

MR. FITZPATRICK TO LORD OSSORY.

July, 1780.

"DEAR BROTHER:—

"I am not surprised you should be curious about the negotiations of which the papers are so full. Charles not having told me a word of the matter, for a very foolish reason, because he thought I should disapprove. For some time I did not believe in it; but upon my asking him, he told me what foundation there had been for it. Lord Rockingham had a message from Lord North by F. Montague, intimating an inclination to make room for them if they were willing to come in, which was answered in the affirmative; but when they came to particulars, strong objections were made to Keppel, to Charles, and to the Duke of Richmond (I forgot to ask if the latter had been consulted). Whether they were ever serious or not I know not, or whether they merely intended to draw them into a negotiation, with a view either to discredit them in the public, or in hopes of increasing the divisions of Opposition, which, indeed, are now as bad as possible, and I am afraid will not be mended by this transaction. I dined at Shelburne House yesterday, and thought he seemed very sore on the subject. He told me that, according to the Court system, they were sounding him at the very moment they were negotiating with

the others. Whatever disposition they showed for coming in, the appointment of Sir H. Palliser seems shutting the door in their faces with a vengeance! Upon the whole, I think they act a ridiculous figure enough, and I dare say the King and Lord Sandwich laugh at them heartily. Lord G. Gordon, it is said, will not be tried before November. Their conduct towards him seems very suspicious. The conduct of the Special Commission, and the number of executions and improper objects fixed upon, give general disgust. They have done their utmost to spread reports of a black conspiracy at the bottom of it all, but hitherto without success. The two waiters from St. Alban's Tavern are to make great discoveries, they say. As our congress met at that tavern, I wonder they don't invent some history upon that subject. Lord Loughborough seems a good instrument for them in the hanging way. He is called Lord Love-*bourreau* by the wits at Brookes's. Charles is not yet well, and is advised going to Bath. He talks of going to-morrow, but I am afraid he will not conform to his physicians' advice; and they say, unless he lives very abstemiously, the waters will do him more harm than good. I hope when all the rebellious women and children are hanged, our camp will break up: I am heartily tired of it, indeed."

[An incident, hardly worth notice, that occurred in the House of Commons when assembled for the first time after the riots of 1780, deserves to be preserved, because it shows the kindly feelings of Mr. Fox towards Lord North, while engaged in the most violent opposition to his government. It is not mentioned or alluded to in the Parliamentary Debates, but is related in a letter to Lord Holland from the Lord Chief Commissioner Adam, whose recollection of it at such a distance of time shows what agreeable impression it had made upon the friends of Lord North when it happened. On the first meeting of Parliament after the riots, Lord North, after reprobating the outrageous conduct of the mob, boldly laid down the grounds of the toleration he had extended to the Roman Catholics, and declared his determination to act on those principles. He spoke powerfully, with liberality and eloquence. Mr. Fox rose after him, applauded the liberality, and

expressed his admiration of the eloquence, with which he had spoken; observing how the true talents and natural disposition of a man broke forth, when relieved from the official trammels that fettered and controlled his mind; and then quoted, with prodigious effect, the lines from Milton—

> "As one who long in populous city pent,
> Where houses thick and sewers annoy the air,
> Forth issuing, on a summer's morn, to breathe
> Among the pleasant villages and farms
> Adjoin'd, from each thing met conceives delight," &c.

This, says Mr. Adam, is my recollection, and I believe it is a pretty accurate one, of what passed near fifty-four years ago.]

[Parliament having been prorogued from the 24th of August to the 28th of September, the dissolution, which was announced on the 1st of September, came rather unexpectedly. Mr. Fox stood for Westminster, and was returned by a large majority over his competitor, Lord Lincoln. While preparing for the contest, he wrote the following letter to Lord Ossory]:—

HON. C. J. FOX TO LORD OSSORY.

"LONDON, *September*, 1780.

"DEAR OSSORY:—

"We are to have a very sharp contest here. I wrote to the Duchess of Bedford, but have had no answer. I hope you have pressed her on the subject, though I rather hope I shall have her votes even if she does not speak *for* me, provided she does not speak against. I wish you could speak to her for Jack Townshend, in case of Lord Euston's giving up, which, I suppose, he must do. But the principal business of this letter is to beg of you to come here for Thursday. I am convinced you may serve me very much, especially as there is so very great a scarcity of gentlemen here; indeed I think you would be the best person to propose me upon the hustings. Pray come, if you can. They say Cheese, the statuary in Piccadilly, has some considerable interest; do you know any way of getting at him? I hope to

God you will not fail being at Cambridge on Saturday. The best thing you can do is to come here Wednesday, stay Thursday, and go Friday to Cambridge. Indeed, I should take your coming here very kindly, and this is not a time to be lazy; everything depends upon the choice of this Parliament, for, notwithstanding the boast of ministers, it is quite clear that we shall rather gain than lose, which will make the thing very near. Adieu.

"Yours affectionately,

(Signed) "C. J. FOX."

[There was a sharp contest for Westminster, which ended in the return of Admiral Rodney and Mr. Fox, the Government candidate, Lord Lincoln, having been defeated. On the following day Mr. Fitzpatrick writes to Lord Ossory:] "Charles is pretty much knocked up. He was yesterday carried triumphantly through the whole town. Admiral Young (proxy for Admiral Rodney, who was at sea) dined with us, which we consider as an acknowledgment that Rodney was more indebted to us for support than to the Court, which was certainly true."

October 9. "Lord Lincoln gave up the scrutiny for Westminster. Charles Fox was returned."

October 31. Parliament met. "The first day in the Commons was appointed for choosing a Speaker. Lord G. Germaine and Mr. Ellis proposed Mr. Cornwall. Sir Fletcher Norton rose and complained that Lord North had not even intimated to him that he was to be laid aside. Charles Fox rose and attacked violently Lord George Germaine, who had paid great compliments to Sir Fletcher. Charles Fox said it was stabbing him in the back, but it was like Lord George's well-known cowardice. He accused Rigby too (who defended himself) of being an enemy of Sir Fletcher, with whom he had formerly had a quarrel. Cornwall was preferred by 203 to 136."

November 6. "In the Commons, Mr. De Gray and Sir Richard Sutton moved the Address on the King's speech. It was opposed by Mr. T. Grenville and Colonel Richard Fitzpatrick. Charles Fox was again very personal to Lord George Germaine, and said

he was unfit to serve the King, as he had been declared so at the head of every regiment in the late reign. Lord George said, he despised personalities and those who offered them."

November 14. "Adam complained of a severe advertisement from the Westminster Association, who said they would guard Charles Fox's invaluable life; as those who attacked him, and other patriots (meaning also Fullarton, who fought Lord Shelburne) were sure of being rewarded. He was severe on Fox's private life, and panegyrized his own virtues, and said they who adopted such advertisements were infamous. Fox made a temperate answer; denied having known of the vote of the Committee, and imputed it to their zeal for him. Fitzpatrick said the same of his absence, but that he approved the vote. 'Then,' said Adam, 'he comes under my description.' Fitzpatrick replied cleverly, that he had not applied the words to Adam, and, if he applied the words to himself, he could not help it. As they stood, he *did* approve them."

"The Navy being moved, Charles Fox fell severely on Lord Sandwich, for having, at that moment, set up Sir Hugh Palliser for Huntingdon. After Christmas he should move for the dismission of Lord Sandwich, and then for bringing him to condign punishment for his mismanagement of the navy."

December 6. "House of Commons adjourned; half Opposition had not appeared. Scarce anybody but Charles Fox and T. Townshend."

December 31. "Count Welderen went away without taking leave, and thus the year finished with the outset of a new war. Yet the Scotch had so infatuated and poisoned the nation, that the Dutch war was popular, at least in the city, where the spirit of gaming had seized all ranks, and nothing was thought of but privateering. The people were told and believed that the Opposition encouraged America, and that several rich persons had been ruined by sending money thither. The Opposition were all split and inactive. The Duke of Richmond on one side, Lord Shelburne and Lord Camden on the other, would not come to Parlia-

ment. And the Government which had precipitated us into all these calamities, and achieved nothing, were more popular."

1781.

February 1. "Charles Fox's motion to censure the nomination of Sir Hugh Palliser to government of Greenwich Hospital. His panegyric on General Conway—Governor Johnstone's artful but severe speech against Keppel and the illuminators—House sat till three in the morning—Motion rejected by 214 to 149."

February 19. "A conversation of severity on Admiral Darby's having declined the French fleet, Mr. Fox added that he had heard that Governor Johnstone had sent from Portsmouth, whither he was gone to sail with the grand fleet for the relief of Gibraltar, a complaint to Lord Hillsborough that the fleet was in a rotten condition, and not fit to sail. Not one Minister denied it; but next day it was given out that Johnstone had only complained of one ship not being ready at the time it had been promised."

February 26. "Mr. Burke's renewed bill for reduction of Civil List was read a second time, and rejected by 233 to 190. Lord Shelburne's friends did not attend it. The young men in Opposition made a considerable figure, particularly John Townshend [second son to the Viscount], and Sheridan [manager of the theatre], both intimate friends of Charles Fox, and William Pitt [younger son of the great Lord Chatham], who, Lord North declared, made the best *first* speech he ever heard."

Mr. Pitt's first speech, brilliant and wonderful as it was, was scarcely more remarkable than the warmth and generosity with which Mr. Fox greeted the appearance and extolled the performance of his future rival. Incapable of jealousy, and delighted at the sudden display of talents nearly equal to his own, he hurried up to the young member to compliment and encourage him. As he was doing so, an old member of the House (I think a General Grant) passed by them and said, "Ay, Mr. Fox, you are praising young Pitt for his speech. You may well do so; for, excepting

yourself, there's no man in the House can make such another; and, old as I am, I expect and hope to hear you both battling it within these walls as I have done your fathers before you." Mr. Fox, disconcerted at the awkward turn of the compliment, was silent and looked foolish; but young Pitt, with great delicacy, readiness, and felicity of expression, answered, "I have no doubt, general, you would like to attain the age of Methusaleh." He had not, however, to live so very long to see his prediction fulfilled. Till the unfortunate breach between the Whigs and Lord Shelburne, when Mr. Pitt sided with the latter, Mr. Fox never lost an opportunity of extolling the talents and praising the conduct of young Pitt; and Sir Samuel Romilly, who was in the gallery when he made his second speech, writes, in a private letter to Mr. Roget, dated 11th January, 1782: "Fox, in an exaggerated strain of panegyric, said he could no longer lament the loss of Lord Chatham, for he was again living in his son, with all his virtues and all his talents." (See *Romilly's Correspondence*, vol. i. p. 192.)—V. H.

March 26. On Sir G. Savile's motion for inquiry on the loan, "Charles Fox most severe on Lord North."

April. Lord North moved for a *secret* committee on miscarriages in East Indies. "Burke, Charles Fox, and others, contended for its being only a *select* committee. Fox, in one of his capital speeches, was most justly severe on Lord North, for inciting inquiries into the conduct of others and preventing all scrutiny into his own, which had brought so many disgraces and losses on us. He arraigned, too, the pusillanimity of a late proclamation, in which we submitted to a neutrality in the Baltic, if the French did not attack us there. The secret committee was preferred by 134 to 80."

May. In the debate on Sir George Savile's motion to refer the county petitions to a committee of the whole House, "Charles Fox shone transcendently, and drew a picture of the Chancellor, like an enraged bull, tossing, wounding, trampling on the rest of Ministers whom he despised."

May 17. Horace Walpole writes to Sir Horace Mann: "Late-

ness of hours is the principal feature of the times, and certainly demands no stress of invention. Every fashionable place is still crowded—no instance of selection neither. Gaming is yet general, though money, the principal ingredient, does not abound. My old favorite game, 'faro,' is lately revived. I have played but twice, and not all night, as I used to do. It is not decent to end where one began, nor to sit up with a generation by two descents my juniors. Mr. Fox is the first figure in all the places I have mentioned; the hero in Parliament, at the gaming-table, at Newmarket. Last week, he passed twenty-four hours without interruption at all three, or on the road from the one to the other, and ill the whole time, for he has a bad[1] constitution, and treats it as if he had been dipped in the immortal river; but I doubt at least his heel will be vulnerable."

June. "About this time, William Pitt, second son of the great Lord Chatham, made a most shining figure in Opposition."

"Charles Fox, seconded by Lord Nugent, obtained leave to bring in a bill to repeal the Marriage Act."

June 11. "On bill for obliging public accountants to pay the balance in their hands into the Treasury, T. Townshend and Charles Fox very severe on Lord North's indolence and eagerness to get hold of public money. The latter (Charles Fox) vindicated his father as Paymaster, and attacked Rigby on his last year's inclination to quarrel with Lord North, and his time-serving since, for fear of being attacked as Paymaster."

June 12. "Mr. Fox's motion for a committee to consider the American War. He showed the utter impossibility of subduing America from Lord Cornwallis's last dispatches in the Gazette. Sir Thomas Clarges, who had constantly voted with Administration, declared he had been deceived by them, and would support them no longer. Rigby, in answer to Charles Fox the preceding

[1] Why he says his constitution was a bad one I cannot divine; I should say nearly the strongest I ever knew, and it was the constant joke of his less fortunate friends, especially Hare, that he did not know what sickness was, and imagined a spoonful of rhubarb to be a cure for all the ills that could befall the human body.—V. H.

day, affirmed that every man of consequence had, at one time or other, voted for the American war, and that to declare for peace now would be to encourage France. The motion was rejected by 172 to 99."

June 15. "Charles Fox carried the commitment of his bill for repealing the Marriage Act, by 90 to 27. Mr. Courtney made a much-admired speech for the repeal."

June 20. "Sold by auction the library of Charles Fox, which had been taken in execution.[1] Amongst the books was Mr. Gibbon's first volume of Roman History, which appeared by the title-page to have been given by the author to Mr. Fox, who had written in it the following anecdote: 'The author, at Brookes's, said there was no salvation for this country till six heads of the principal persons in the Administration were laid on the table; eleven days after, the same gentleman accepted the place of Lord of Trade, under those very Ministers, and has acted with them ever since!' Such was the avidity of bidders for the smallest production of so wonderful a genius, that by the addition of this little record the book sold for three guineas."

June 15. "Great altercations in both Houses on the peculiar severity to American prisoners, on complaints of Charles Fox and the Duke of Richmond. The Lord Advocate [Dundas] was grossly abusive on the Opposition for supporting rebels, and against Charles Fox, who had been as bitter on the Scotch for having formerly committed so many rebellions; Lord Loughborough as angry at the Duke of Richmond for reflecting on the poverty of Scotland. Both motions were rejected. The Chancellor [Thurlow], who took every opportunity of differing with ministers, par-

[1] There was a trial in the Common Pleas, before the sale of these books, to establish Mr. Fox's property in them. The note quoted in the text, being in Mr. Fox's handwriting, was offered in proof, and Lord Loughborough (not perhaps over-anxious to screen his political enemy's property from seizure) was on the point of admitting the evidence, but when, on glancing his eye over the words inserted, he found they would expose his friend Mr. Gibbon, friendship, favor, good-nature, or a recollection of the law, made him reject the evidence as inadmissible.—V. H.

ticularly Lords Bathurst and Sandwich, and indeed with everybody, took no part against the Duke of Richmond, and when the alterations in the Marriage Bill came from the other House, he paid the highest compliments to Charles Fox, the author, though he opposed its being decided so very late in the session, and it was rejected."

July 18. Parliament rose.

Mr. Fox had not gained in the mind of the King. [In a note to Lord North, he animadverted on the motion Mr. Fox made at the beginning of the session, against Sir Hugh Palliser, in words that deserve to be recorded, as evidence of the unfavorable impression he had formed and still retained of a man who was destined, within less than eighteen months, to be one of his principal Secretaries of State.] "The question proposed by Mr. Fox, about the appointment of Sir Hugh Palliser to the government of Greenwich Hospital, was unjust and indecent, *as everything that comes from that quarter must necessarily be.*"

[If such was the dislike of Mr. Fox, entertained by the King, it is no less true that Mr. Fox had an equally unfavorable opinion of his Majesty, whom he regarded as the chief, if not the sole, cause of all the calamities and dangers which at that time oppressed and threatened to extinguish us as a nation.] "I agree with you in thinking," he writes to Fitzpatrick on the 9th of September, 1781, "that the people of this country in general deserve no pity, and certainly the King still less. But is it not a little hard upon us, who expected to play some part upon the stage of the world, and who had certainly at least the shares of individuals in the greatness of the country, to be obliged to bound our hopes, nay, our wishes, to being able some way or other to heal the wounds made by others, and to put this country, which was the first in Europe, upon a footing to be one amongst the other nations of the world? I dare say you think even this more than we can do; but to those who ever had any ambition, good God! what is this? Indeed, indeed, it is intolerable to think that it should be in the power of one blockhead to do so much mischief. The more I think of the whole of the business, the more I feel averse to

coming in upon any terms, unless on those of parliamentary condemnation of what is past. Pray, continue to write. I cannot help hoping that we may still avoid an engagement in Europe. Read the speech of Richard Plantagenet in 'Henry VI.' when France is lost, and if I do not forget (for there is no Shakspeare here) it is very consonant to our feelings upon this wretched situation of affairs."

The spirits of the Ministry and their friends, which had been greatly raised by some successes in America, and especially the capture of Charlestown, were again damped by the surrender of Lord Cornwallis and his division as prisoners of war. Fresh courage was infused into the Americans, and our last hopes of conquest seemed to be fast vanishing away.

On November 26, H. Walpole says to Sir Horace Mann: "The warmth in the House of Commons is prodigiously rekindled; but Lord Cornwallis's fate has lost the Administration no ground *there*. The two names of most *éclat* in the Opposition are two names to which those walls have been much accustomed at the same period—Charles Fox, and William Pitt, second son of Lord Chatham. Eloquence is the only one of our brilliant qualities that does not seem to have degenerated rapidly."

November 27. "The House of Commons was as tenacious of pensions and places, and after a debate that lasted till two, the same amendment [as was moved in Lords] failed by the votes of 218 to 229. The attack was made chiefly on Lord G. Germaine and Lord Sandwich, and, indeed, even by the former on the latter, insomuch that Mr. Fox said he intended to impeach the Earl, and should depend on Lord George as his principal evidence."

November 28. On the report, "a more remarkable though shorter debate, Mr. W. Pitt made a most brilliant figure to the admiration of all sides; but the Lord Advocate [Dundas] occasioned most surprise. Affecting great frankness, he seemed to adopt the language of Opposition, who both then and the day before had called on Ministers to declare whether they meant to persist in the war in America. He seemed to accuse Ministers of disunion, and to blame some who did not in council deliver their sincere opinions;

but the day was at hand, he said, that would force them to speak out. With all this air of frankness, few knew what he meant or whom he meant to blame; and the more he was pressed, the more obscure and shuffling he grew. Charles Fox did urge him home to declare whom he blamed, and what the day was that was to extort truth. He immediately said, 'he did not impute any guilt to Lord North.' Fox as immediately said, it was kind to except Lord North, for everybody's eyes had been turned on him. But the Advocate evaded all further reply, and would only say that the decision would be made when the vote of the Army should come in question."

"The King, as if he had never used the Duke of Gloucester ill, opened his mind to him on his son, the Prince of Wales, and his other brother, the Duke of Cumberland, the latter of whom, he said, was governed by Charles Fox and Fitzpatrick, and governed the Prince of Wales, whom they wanted to drive into Opposition. 'When we hunt together,' said the King, 'neither my son nor my brother will speak to me; and lately, when the chase ended at a little village where there was but a single post-chaise to be hired, my son and brother got into it, drove to London, and left me to get home in a cart, if I could find one.' He complained, too, that the Prince, when invited to dine with him, came an hour too late, and 'all the servants saw the father waiting an hour for the son.'"

December 10. "A great meeting of Westminster voters in Westminster Hall, to consider of a petition similar to the City's; it was moved by Charles Fox, and approved, but with the utmost tranquillity, for the people, though in vast numbers, seemed to be perfectly indifferent, and to have assembled only from curiosity. Yet the Court, fearing or hoping a tumult, had a large body of Guards in readiness."

December 11 "was the day for voting the Army, when the Lord Advocate had declared the Ministers would be forced to speak out. A few days before, Charles Fox asked him whether the Ministers *would* speak out then? That *honest* man said, 'I believe *not, but do press them.*'"

Then follows some account of Sir James Lowther's motion against "any further attempts in America," Lord North's answer, Dunning's reply. "The Lord Advocate pretended to understand Lord North as declaring against a land war; Charles Fox pressed Lord North over and over again to say if that was his meaning, but he would not say a word more. Lord G. Germaine talked of the unanimity of Ministers, but no mortal believed him. Burke made a wild, passionate speech. He was now grown so heated, and uttered such rhapsodies, that he was generally very ill heard." "The motion was rejected but by a majority of forty-one."

December 14. Another remarkable debate on Army, in which Pitt made a speech, "with amazing logical abilities, exceeding all he had hitherto shown, and making men doubt whether he would not prove superior even to Charles Fox." After an account of Rigby's speech and motives, Walpole adds: "Mr. Fox called on Lord Advocate to speak out, as he had promised, and said it would become his manly character. The Lord Advocate (perhaps softened by his Scotch friends, or aware that he had displeased the King) replied angrily, that he would maintain his own character, and if others looked to theirs, they would have enough to do."

December 17. "Admiral Kempenfeldt sent word that he had found five more French men-of-war, of 110 or 112 guns, than he expected, and not venturing to attack so superior a force, he had retired, and the French were proceeding on their voyage. Great alarm for the West Indies. Great indignation against Lord Sandwich, who either had not intelligence, or had sent Kempenfeldt with so inferior a force, though we had six ships lying idle in the Downs. Lord Rockingham, Admiral Keppel, and Charles Fox had said publicly that Lord Sandwich was mistaken, and that Kempenfeldt would have found nineteen or twenty men-of-war at Brest. This proved true what Lord Stormont had said, the first day of the session, that Lord Sandwich would employ no cutters on intelligence."

December 20. "G. Byng, hearing Sir Grey Cooper propose to adjourn, cried, 'Good God! adjourn! we ought to sit through

the holidays to inquire into this miscarriage.' T. Townshend and Charles Fox recalled to mind how during such an adjournment the French war had broken out. It was agreed there should be a formal inquiry after the holidays, Lord North pretending that Lord Sandwich himself desired it."

After mentioning the Duke of Richmond's motion to inquire into Lord Rawdon's conduct in executing Haynes, Horace Walpole relates what happened on Lord Rawdon's return from Ireland. He very uncharitably and groundlessly suspects that Lord Rawdon, in challenging the Duke of Richmond, "was secretly instigated to that brutality;" and adds, "the recent instances of Charles Fox and Lord Shelburne challenged by Scots, who were notoriously set on by other Scots, proved that indirect *assassination was a favorite manœuvre of the instruments of the Court.*"

Nothing can be more malignant or groundless than this insinuation of H. Walpole. Though it is uncharitable to impute bad motives where they cannot be proved, it might be admissible for an impartial historian, unacquainted with the individual characters, to conjecture that one or more of these persons might have been forward in challenging remarkable men, obnoxious to the Court, with a view of pleasing the powerful, as well as of resenting an injury, real or supposed; but that they were base enough to be *employed* in such a *manœuvre*, which then might well be termed *assassination*, or that the King or the gentlemen composing his Court or his Cabinet were capable of instigating such a proceeding, is a supposition utterly inconsistent with the character of the times and of the individuals, and could not, I think, be sincerely harbored by Horace Walpole himself. Both Adam and Lord Moira were men of high honor, of excellent, warm, affectionate and kind feelings. Walpole's propensity to impute the very basest and most improbable motives to those whom he disliked, shakes one's confidence either in his judgment or in his integrity, to a degree that diminishes the value of his long, laborious, and entertaining journals and memoirs.—V. H.

[The pertinacity with which the King opposed, to the last moment, the recognition of the United States, and the rooted

aversion he entertained for all who differed from him on that point, seem not to have been in the slightest degree abated by the surrender of Lord Cornwallis and his army. On the 26th of December, 1781, he consents to Lord George Germaine's resignation, provided his retreat is dignified by his elevation to the peerage.] "No one can then say he is disgraced; and when the appointment of Sir Guy Carleton [Lord George's enemy, who was intended to be sent a Commissioner to America] accompanies his retreat, it will be ascribed to its true cause, and not to any change in my sentiments on the essential point, namely, the getting a peace at the expense of a separation from America, which no difficulties can get me to consent to."

1782.

The following letter from Mr. Fox to Sir George Macartney, though in itself unimportant, may serve to show the frank, easy, and communicative footing which, even in the turmoil of politics, he preserved with his early friends, who were either indifferent or adverse to the cause in which he was so earnestly engaged.

HON. C. J. FOX TO SIR GEORGE MACARTNEY.

LONDON, *January* 26, 1782.

"MY DEAR MACARTNEY:—

"Among the many recommendations I have made to you since your going to India, there has not been one in which I have been so really earnest as in favor of Mr. Charles Forsyth, who will deliver you this. He is the natural son of Codrington, who, from his acquaintance with you, would certainly have written to you himself, if he had not been deterred from doing so by a recollection of the part he and some of his friends took with respect to your appointment. I told him I was sure I knew enough of you to know that this was an ill-judged delicacy; but as he persisted in it, I think myself the more obliged to entreat of you to do all you can with propriety do in favor of this young man, as his father is one of the men in the world for whom, upon long ac-

quaintance, I have the greatest esteem. I am sensible that I have been exceedingly troublesome to you with recommendations, but many of them have been simple introductions and desires of general protection, rather than anything else. In this instance, I do assure you, I feel at least as strongly as I write. With regard to everything here, I can only say that the situation of politics grows every day less intelligible. It was hardly known, for many days, whether Lord George Germaine was in or out; and it is still as great a secret as ever what is to become of the American war. All that is to be clearly known is that this country is devoted, by the obstinacy of those who govern it (though God knows who they are), to certain and inevitable ruin. We are now attacking, in the House of Commons, your friend Sandwich, and we shall be very strong in numbers, and still stronger in fact and reason, against him, but not quite strong enough, I fear, to carry it. With respect to myself, I am very well in health and spirits; and having long since given up all hopes of things going right in this country, am very little personally affected with anything that happens in public."

February 8. "Mr. Fox, in a motion on the abuses of the navy, was very personal to Lord Sandwich, whom of late he had pursued with much violence. I told him of it, and of his wasting his fire on a secondary character, whom all the rest were willing to sacrifice. I advised him to make his push at Lord North, as, if the keystone could be removed, the whole edifice would fall. He owned I was right, and he took my advice."

This may be so, but Mr. Fox never had much intimate intercourse with Horace Walpole, did not, I think, like him at all, had no opinion of his judgment or conduct, probably had imbibed some prejudice against him for his ill-usage of his father, and certainly entertained an unfavorable and even unjust opinion of his abilities as a writer. H. Walpole was, however, better acquainted and even intimate with many of his friends, the Duke of Richmond, Lord Ossory, General Fitzpatrick, and others.—V. H.

February 19. In a debate on the Mutiny Bill, Burke, Fox, and General Conway reflected severely on the traitor Arnold.

February 20. "Charles Fox moved an inquiry into Lord Sandwich's mismanagement of the navy during 1781. He had intended and threatened an inquiry into the whole administration, which would have furnished more matter of censure, at least, of discussion. I forget why it was thought more proper to narrow the question to one year.[1] The motion was rejected by a majority of 19, a small one, prognosticating the downfall of the Ministry."

February 22. "General Conway moved to address the King to give directions to his Ministers to use all means in their power to restore peace and to give up all thoughts of subduing America." Walpole recites the heads of his speech with great commendation, and says, "the effect was incredible," and observes, "it was easy to persuade men to repent, when it was for their immediate advantage," and that "the fall of Lord G. Germaine had made the fabric totter." Ellis, the new secretary, made a temporizing, contradictory speech, which said nothing, but enough to show that he only wanted to conceal what he thereby discovered, his inclination to continue the war. Burke "showed that the person was changed, not the system." "Jenkinson was less oracular, and Charles Fox accordingly applied a much harsher comment on him, as one who was the mouth of the oracle, of which Ellis was only the statue; but, as if Fox had embraced all the notions that had been held about oracles (to which, indeed, he did not even allude), he mentioned the *infernal spirit*, that really ruled and had nearly ruined the country. He then turned to another of the bunch and said, should the Lord Advocate not vote for the motion, what he had said before the holidays would bear the construction of having arisen from *personal animosity*, otherwise how was his speaking against one Minister and supporting another to be accounted for? Fox might ask, but Dundas wanted no commentator long; in six months he fully explained his own comment, and that he had acted not from *personal animosity*, but from *personal interest*. At two the House divided, and rejected Conway's motion—but by a

[1] Probably to meet the ideas and secure the support of recent converts to Opposition.—V. H.

majority of *one voice* only! The numbers being 194 to 193, ample intelligence to all who were waiting to see which way the scale would incline. Mr. Fox, too alert not to profit of a doubtful field, immediately gave notice that the same question, in another shape, would be renewed in a few days, and the more necessary, as Lord North had given notice that he should open the budget on an early day. Colonel Barré reproached Lord North bitterly for that notice, when he ought to have brought forward another business which he had utterly neglected, especially the reports of the Commissioners, whom he had kept employed for two years, and yet had let their papers lie on the table like lumber. He called him the scourge of the country, with many harsh additions and accusations. Lord North, who was a laughing philosopher only when backed by numbers, finding himself so hard run by the division, wanted nothing but this new provocation to overset his temper. He fell into a furious rage, and said he had been so used, from that quarter, to language so uncivil, so brutal, so insolent—At the sound of these words there was an immediate uproar in the House; the Speaker and the almost triumphant Opposition called him to order, and T. Townshend, in no less severe terms, complained of such language from a Minister, as totally annihilating all freedom of debate. Lord North said he was ready to own he had gone too far, but desired the House to recollect the provocation, and that he would ask pardon of the House, but not of Barré. After a tumult of three hours, Lord North was forced to make an apology even to Barré."

I place here the following letter :—

HON. C. J. FOX TO LORD OSSORY.

"*February*, 1782.

"Dear Ossory:—

"I never was more sorry to hear you were gone out of town; I think the business of the loan, Monday, is likely to be of as much consequence towards deciding the fate of these people, as any day this year. If you can possibly come, pray do; for it is

really childish, when attendance is of such real importance, to give it up from mere idleness. Wednesday is fixed for renewing the American question. I think it seems to be the general opinion, that the thing is over, and that they must go, but it is not mine.

"Yours affectionately,
"C. J. FOX."

February 27. "The decisive blow was given to an Administration which had given the most fatal stab to the glory and interest of England, by (I believe) planning—certainly by taking no step to prevent—pushing on, and persisting in the American war, and who had, by the countenance of the Crown and by the arts of the Scotch and the intoxication of the nation, maintained themselves under the greatest disgraces and losses this country had ever sustained—disgraces in a great measure the consequences of impolicy, early neglect, and rash perseverance in a hopeless project. And though they struggled for a fortnight longer, not without a slight gleam of hope, they could not recover their defeat. General Conway, who had been the principal instrument of the repeal of the Stamp Act—a service that would have preserved tranquillity in America, had not the same pernicious arts that had embroiled it rekindled the flames—had the honor of commanding this day and of making the motion which gave victory to the Opposition, and by its consequences liberty to America and peace to England. He moved to declare the purpose of subduing the revolted colonies by force impracticable—as both sides were sensible it was—though above 200 members could not be induced to make the confession; yet between one and two in the morning the question was carried by 234 votes to 215. The debate may be found at large in various publications. The debates in general have been so accurately taken and published of late years, that I willingly omit them in this journal, become far too voluminous, and which I have continued so long merely to preserve certain passages less known, and to aid future historians, *not intending the journalist part for any other use*, which, from

my retirement from the public scene, from my total disconnection with Ministers, from satiety of politics, and from disgust with so fatal a war and so impotent and shameful an Administration, I have furnished very imperfectly; and though I have again been master of many lights by the accession of some few of my friends to power, yet age and indolence have unfitted me for taking pains to inform myself; and the slight notes I *have* preserved and do set down of the changes that happened in 1782 and 1783, will be chiefly such as I can warrant the truth of, and are not likely to be found in narratives of men much less conversant with some of the principal actors."

March 4. "The King being addressed by the Commons, in consequence of this late resolution for suspending the American war, his Majesty sternly and ungraciously told them that he should, in pursuance of their advice, take such measures as should appear to him ('to *me*,' said he, emphatically) to be most conducive to the restoration of harmony between Great Britain and the revolted colonies. Authority so ill-timed, and so impoliticly assumed in the moment of defeat, spoke very intelligibly what sort of spirit would have displayed itself, had the colonies, as his flatterers had promised him, been reduced to unconditional submission, and what measure would have been dealt out to the Opposition had the royal army returned triumphant. Prerogative, that spoke in so high a tone to a House of Commons, that had bound its hands, would soon have issued *lettres de cachet de par le Roi*."

March 4. "That vexation, not firmness, had dictated the King's response was evident, for the same day he sent for the Chancellor, Thurlow, and told him Lord North must give up his post. As there was no cordiality between the Prime Minister and Chancellor, the latter was not secret on the communication made to him; and, by divulging, perhaps expedited Lord North's fall. Thurlow did not foresee that, in less than a year and a half, himself would be the disgraced minister, and have his dismission signified to him by Lord North. The latter asked whether, if he was to retire,

he must yet propose the taxes? 'Yes,' he was told; '*he* had borrowed the money.'

"Charles Fox proposed to the House of Commons to complain of the King's answer; but General Conway, who had moved an address of thanks for that answer, Thomas Pitt, Sir Gilbert, and others, overruled Fox, and declared against violence. Rigby attacked the new majority warmly, but was corrected by young William Pitt, who told him the nation *was weary of paying him.* The Address was voted. The Commons went further, and declared such *enemies* who should advise or attempt further prosecution of the American war."

March 6. "Lord North, not being ready with his taxes, but obliged to postpone them, was severely handled by Charles Fox and Burke."

March 8. Lord J. Cavendish proposed four resolutions to the House of Commons. The first, that the war had cost 100,000,000*l.*; the second, to state our losses; the third, that, besides America, we were at war with France, Spain, and Holland; and the fourth, which, as the three preceding, were self-evident propositions: nobody could deny that all were owing to the want of foresight and ability in the King's Ministers, whom he should move to have changed. There seemed to be a little precipitation in these motions, though it is scarcely wise not to pursue a victory; yet, as Lord North was in three days to open his taxes, it was most probable they would excite more enemies to him, and therefore, as he had often recovered from many slippery situations, it might have been prudent to secure all advantages against him. This reasoning appeared just, for Lord John's motions were rejected by a majority of ten.

Lord Maitland (Lauderdale) reproached Ministers with having often defied and called for charges, and now endeavored to avoid them by the most pitiful shifts. Sir Fletcher Norton, who had long borne enmity to Rigby, for a former offence, dragged him into the debate, and complained of the vast sum of money in the Paymaster's hands, and said, if interest was made of that money, it ought to belong to the public, and declared that if the Crown

lawyers did not take up the matter, he would. Rigby defended himself, and at the same time not only retorted severely on Sir Fletcher, whose character furnished ample matter, but a little indiscreetly on Fox, with the highest encomiums on his friend, the Lord Advocate, whose speech of that day he pronounced the finest he had ever heard; a proof of which he said was, that it was the speech which had most galled the Opposition. Sheridan replied wittily, that if those speeches were the best which gave most offence, Rigby himself was the Demosthenes of the House. It was very true—nobody was so apt to provoke by indiscreet violence. But the most remarkable incident of the day was a far greater indiscretion of one who, soon afterwards, became a capital personage. This was young William Pitt, second son of the renowned Lord Chatham, who had already much distinguished himself by his premature eloquence. The debate had turned much on a new arrangement of Ministers. Pitt said he knew not who they would be, but he felt himself obliged to declare (even that was not very modest) that he himself could not expect to take any share in a new Administration, and were his doing so more within his reach, he never would accept a *subordinate* situation. So arrogant a declaration from a boy who had gained no experience from, nor ever enjoyed even the lowest post in any office, and who for half a dozen orations (extraordinary indeed, but no evidence of capacity for business) presumed himself fit for command, proved that he was a boy, and a very ambitious and a very vain one. The moment he sat down, he was aware of his folly, and said he could bite his tongue out for what it had uttered; but though he lamented his imprudence, it was of his frankness he repented. In a very few months he showed that he had neither corrected his vanity nor his ambition.

"Lord North, on the 10th of March, declared to the King that he was determined to resign his post. The Lord Advocate, who had opened the breach, which he had intended should soon be closed by his own stopping all the gap he had projected, in the dismission of Lord G. Germaine, perceiving now that much more of the fabric would tumble than he had approved, had, since

the 27th, talked much of the *coalition of parties*, and even proposed to search for some unexceptionable man, under whom all parties might unite, but he was disregarded, as he deserved, nor was he long in finding his account in the mischief he had made. He did find it just long enough to give him occasion to display farther his versatility."

"It was to another hand the King intrusted the office of making a new arrangement. It was the Chancellor Thurlow he commissioned to sound Lord Rockingham with overtures of appointing him First Minister. I must premise that I imagine the Chancellor, from that and other occasional confidences, entertained some views occasionally of becoming First Minister himself. It is sure, at least, that he acted cordially with no other Premier. But his indolence, his want of policy, and brutality of temper might occasion his inharmonious behavior, as the last had evidently more part in his fall in the succeeding year than intrigue or ambition." "When the Chancellor opened his business to Lord Rockingham, the latter asked him if he came by authority. 'No,' said Thurlow; 'but your lordship may trust to me.' The Marquis replied that he could not listen to him unless he came by authority. The Chancellor said he would come with it the next day."[1]

March 13. "It was publicly given out that Lord North had resigned, or intended it; yet, the next day, he determined to encounter a repetition of Lord J. Cavendish's last motions, which he knew were to be made."

March 15. "On the 15th, the same attack was renewed, and by a hand that gave more weight, being that of Sir J. Rous, till this time much devoted to Lord North, and a Tory by principle, as he avowed, and who said he had loved the amiableness of Lord North's private character. He renewed Lord John's four questions, prefacing them by a declaration that the facts contained were the reasons why he could not place any confidence in the

[1] Here follows very tedious and indistinct proof, founded on the Mutiny Bill and on Irish politics, of the influence of Jenkinson over the King's mind.—V. H.

King's Ministers. Yet not this defection of a creditable friend, nor the probability of a change, nor the solicitations of the Prince of Wales, who made interest against Lord North, though he influenced but one vote (that of Lord Melbourne[1]), were as yet efficacious to overturn the Minister. The motions, after a long debate, were rejected, and Lord North had a majority of nine for him. Certain it is, nothing could exceed the aversion of the King—not to parting with his Minister, but to accepting one by force. All his arts, little ones, indeed, were employed to avoid that humiliation; and though he succeeded in the only artifice in which he ever had succeeded, sowing division, yet he not only avoided no mortification, but laid a foundation for receiving much greater, as he felt in a twelvemonth after.

March 18. "The Chancellor went again to Lord Rockingham,[2] on how silly a message appeared by its no effect, though a man of so great talents was the messenger, and a man of so slender parts the receiver. The Chancellor's mission was to persuade the Marquis to accept the Administration, and to settle the terms afterwards. The Marquis gave a direct negative. Had the Marquis been so weak as to yield, perhaps his Majesty might have comforted himself with duping, exposing, and ruining him with his party, and in the eyes of the public, and not continued to meditate a project that spoke nothing but unconquerable obstinacy and childish desperation. He not only talked of returning to Hanover, but it *is most certain* that for a fortnight together the Royal yacht was expediting and preparing for transporting [him]. What fur-

[1] Created, January 11, 1781, an Irish peer.

[2] In one of those conversations Lord Rockingham mentioned the measures he should expect to be adopted if he came into place, as—peace with America; general peace; disqualifying of contractors from sitting in Parliament, and revenue officers from voting at elections; and plans of economy: but the Chancellor avoided the discussion, saying, "it would be more proper *after* the new Administration should be settled, than *before*, and that for his part the object of his mission was to enable the King to quiet internal commotions—though at that time none subsisted but the general distaste to the war."—H. W.

ther steps he meant to take I do not pretend to know, nor whether he had digested any plan whether his secession was to be permanent or temporary; whether he meant to leave the Queen Regent, or to carry her and the younger children with him. Such moody peevishness probably had not looked for, nor fixed upon any system, when it was not possible that any one should satisfy him. The thought, however, was not novel.[1] I have heard from the best authority that, in the heat of Wilkes's war on him, he had meditated a parallel retreat."

March 20. "Though no steps had been taken that promised a new settlement, Lord North declared the Administration was dissolved."

[On the 17th of March, after the motion of Sir John Rous in the Commons, the King writes to Lord North]: "Sorry to find that the majority this morning did not exceed nine. It looks as if the House of Commons were going lengths that could not have been expected. I am resolved not to throw myself into the hands of Opposition at all events, and shall certainly, if things go as they seem to tend, know what my conscience as well as honor dictates, as the only way left for me." [Lord North's reply to this mysterious announcement of what his Majesty intended to do, in case the House of Commons persisted in their resolution to put an end to the American war, must have expressed more strongly than he had hitherto done his determination to resign, for on the following day the King writes to him]: "After having yesterday assured you, in the most solemn manner, that my sentiments of honor would not permit me to send for any of the leaders of Opposition,

[1] The present King, George IV., told me a story of his father's plan of retiring to Hanover, and described, with more humor than filial reverence, his arrangement of the details, and especially of the liveries and dresses, about which he was so earnest that it amounted almost to insanity. The period, however, of these strange fancies was, I think, that of Lord George Gordon's riots, not of the fall of Lord North's ministry—perhaps he might have talked of such a project on both occasions, and he was more likely to communicate his half-formed intentions to his son in 1780 than in 1782.—V. H.

and personally treat with them, I could not but be hurt at your letter of last night. Every man must be the sole judge of his own feelings; therefore, whatever you *or any man can say has no avail with me.* Till I have heard what the Chancellor has done from his own mouth, I shall take no step; and if you resign before I have decided what to do, you will certainly forever forfeit my regard." [It is but justice, however, to George III. to add that, after this ebullition of temporary resentment, his letter to Lord North, when the sacrifice had been consummated, ends with his former expressions of affection and regard. On the 27th of March, he writes]: "At length the fatal day is come, which the misfortunes of the times, and the sudden change of sentiments of the House of Commons have driven me to, of changing my Ministers, and a more general removal of other persons, than, I believe, was ever known before. I have to the last fought for individuals, but the number I have saved, except my Bedchamber, is incredibly few. You could hardly believe that even the Duke of Montague was strongly hinted at; but I declared that I would sooner let confusion follow than part with the late governor of my sons, and so unexceptionable a man. So that he and Lord Ashburnham remain. The effusion of my sorrows has made me say more than I intended; but I ever did, and ever shall, look on you as a friend, as well as a faithful servant."

CHANGE OF ADMINISTRATION, 1782.

[FROM THE ORIGINAL IN THE HANDWRITING OF GENERAL FITZPATRICK.]

Wednesday, the 20th of March, 1782. Lord North announced to the House of Commons the resignation of the Ministry. At his instance, the House consented to an adjournment, in order to afford time for the arrangement of their successors, till Monday. Previous to this the Chancellor had been with Lord Rockingham, to know upon what terms he would undertake to form an Administration. He answered, that the measures he should propose were as follows: A power to accede to the independence of America;

a reduction of the influence of the Crown by an abolition of offices; and Bills to deprive contractors of their seats in the House of Commons, and revenue officers of their votes at elections. With respect to any reform in the representation, or limiting the duration of Parliaments, he declined laying himself under any restrictions.

On Monday the House adjourned again.

On Thursday, 21st of March, Lord Shelburne was sent for to Buckingham House. He did not relate to Lord Rockingham what passed between the King and himself, a reserve with which many were dissatisfied. He said, generally, that the conversation had ended in nothing.

Friday and Saturday passed without any further overtures being made to any of the Opposition. Lord Gower was said to have been consulted, but everybody saw the impossibility of forming an Administration without Lord Rockingham and his friends.

On Sunday morning, Lord Shelburne was again sent for. He then came from the King with an offer of the Treasury to Lord Rockingham, himself to be one of the Secretaries of State; and declared himself in possession of full powers from his Majesty to treat both as to men and measures. Lord Rockingham's first impulse was to decline the offer, upon the ground that, if it was the King's intention to place him at the head of the Treasury, he could have no fit objection to conversing with him upon the arrangement of the Administration.

Charles Fox, though he acknowledged the truth of this, joined, however, with the Duke of Richmond in persuading Lord Rockingham to accede to the proposal, in order to avoid the appearance of impeding the formation of a Ministry, from motives which might be ascribed to pique or jealousy, at a moment when the public were naturally extremely anxious and impatient for the establishment of a Government.

Lord Rockingham, however, accompanied his acceptance with a list of those whom he expected should compose the Cabinet, leaving a blank for Lord Shelburne, to fill the office of Chancellor, as

he might be supposed to know Mr. Dunning's inclinations upon that subject. The list was as follows :—

Lord Rockingham . . .	First Lord of the Treasury.
Lord J. Cavendish . . .	Chancellor of the Exchequer
Admiral Keppel . . .	First Lord of the Admiralty.
Duke of Richmond . . .	Master-General of the Ordnance.
Charles Fox & Lord Shelburne	Secretaries of State.
Lord Camden	President of the Council.
Duke of Grafton . . .	Lord Privy Seal.
General Conway . . .	Commander-in-Chief.

A large meeting of members of the House of Commons was held in the evening, at the house of Mr. Thomas Townshend, to whom this list was communicated. According to the general conduct and principles of the persons composing it, Lord Rockingham and Mr. Fox seemed to have the preponderating scale in this arrangement; the list was approved of, and sent to Lord Shelburne, who returned for answer his perfect approbation of it, and transmitted it to the King. On Monday morning, he was to receive the King's answer, and it was resolved at this meeting of Opposition not to accede to any further adjournment of the House of Commons unless these terms were complied with, and to one not exceeding two days if they were. Lord Shelburne wished to have the House adjourned over the Easter holidays, but Charles Fox would not by any means consent to it, and told him his determination to oppose any such measure, if proposed; in which opposition there was no doubt he would have been successful from the temper of the House.

Lord Shelburne staid with the King from eleven o'clock till two, when he came to Charles Fox, who was preparing to go down to the House, and told him the proposals were substantially agreed to, and that Mr. Dunning would move an adjournment one day only for the final arrangement of them. Lord Thurlow was to continue Chancellor. They had a conversation of some length, while several members were waiting in the antechamber to carry down to the House of Commons the result of these negotiations. Charles Fox told Lord Shelburne that he perceived this Adminis-

tration was to consist of two parts—one belonging to the King, the other to the public; an observation the truth of which was very soon confirmed. Lord Shelburne, without concert or communication with the other Ministers, added Mr. Dunning to the Cabinet, which was injudiciously acquiesced in by Lord Rockingham and his friends; he was created Lord Ashburton, and made Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster, with an additional salary during life. In consequence of this promotion, it was thought right that Lord Rockingham should ask a peerage for Sir Fletcher Norton, although none of the party placed much confidence either in his abilities or integrity, but on account of his having been persecuted by the Court for his conduct when Speaker of the House of Commons. Lord Howe and Admiral Keppel were made Viscounts. Colonel Barré was appointed Treasurer of the Navy, and, at Lord Shelburne's instance, got a pension of 2000*l.* a year for life; and Lord Tankerville, another of his friends, was appointed Postmaster, Lord Barrington being removed to make room for him, with a pension of 2000*l.* a year for life. These pensions gave much dissatisfaction to the public, and the odium of them was always artfully thrown upon Lord Rockingham, although his own friend, Mr. Burke, who was appointed Paymaster of the Forces, enjoyed his salary during pleasure only. Considering the principles upon which the Administration came into power, the granting these pensions was certainly not justifiable.

[It may not be uninteresting to add, from Mr. Adam's papers, some farther particulars of the change of Ministry in March, 1782.]

[Between the 8th of March, when Lord John Cavendish made his motion of censure on Ministers, and the 15th, when Sir John Rous moved to withdraw from them the confidence of Parliament, it appears that full powers had been given to the Chancellor, Lord Thurlow, to treat with the Opposition. Lord Thurlow, after giving notice of his commission to Lord Shelburne, had an interview with Lord Rockingham. The demands of Lord Rockingham were the following: That the Contractors' Bill, Burke's

Bill, and Crewe's Bill, should be made Government measures, and that a Ministry should be formed on the basis of peace and economy. To this basis the Chancellor had no objection, but he would not give his consent to the three bills, and so the negotiation ended.]

[Overtures were then made to Lord Gower to undertake the Government. Mr. Adam saw a letter from the King to Mr. Jenkinson on the subject, directing the chancellor] "to take every step to widen the bottom of his Administration;" adding that the King "can never submit to a *total change* without abandoning his *principles* and his *honor*, which he will never do."

[Lord Rockingham, at his own request, had a second meeting with the Chancellor, but insisting on his former demands, the Chancellor declared] "he would have no farther communication with a man who thought the exclusion of a contractor from Parliament, and the disfranchisement of an exciseman, of more importance than the salvation of the country in its present situation. Lord Rockingham," he said, "was bringing things to a pass, where either his head or the King's must go, in order to settle which of them was to govern the country."

[On Wednesday, the 20th of March, when Lord North announced to the House of Commons that the Administration was dissolved, he had been authorized by the King to make that declaration only half an hour before he came down to the House. The King having observed to him that, considering the temper of the Commons, he thought the Administration was at an end, Lord North remarked, "Would it not be better in that case to say so at once?" "Well, you may do so," was the reply. Having obtained this permission, which as far as his own resignation was concerned, he had often before solicited in vain, Lord North hurried down to the House, and as soon as he could obtain a hearing, announced that the Ministry was totally at an end. "He spoke with much sagacity," says Adam, "and a proper feeling on the occasion. No man ever showed more calmness, cheerfulness, and serenity. The temper of his whole family was the same. I dined with them that day, and was witness to it."]

[Lord Holland has left a lively account of the scene that passed in the House of Commons on the night when Lord North announced his Administration was at an end.]

I have heard my uncle Fitzpatrick give a very diverting account of the scene that passed in the House of Commons on the day of Lord North's resignation, which happened to be a remarkably cold day, with a fall of snow. A motion of Lord Surrey's, for the dismissal of Ministers, stood for that day, and the Whigs were anxious that it should come on before the resignation of Lord North was officially announced, that his removal from office might be more manifestly and formally the act of the House of Commons. He and Lord Surrey rose at the same instant; after much clamor, disorder, and some insignificant speeches on order, Mr. Fox, with great quickness and address, moved, as the most regular method of extricating the House from its embarrassment, "that Lord Surrey be now heard." But Lord North, with yet more admirable presence of mind, mixed with pleasantry, rose immediately, and said, "I rise to speak to that motion;" and, as his reason for opposing it, stated his resignation and the dissolution of the Ministry. The House, satisfied, became impatient, and after some ineffectual efforts of speakers on both sides to procure a hearing, an adjournment took place. Snow was falling, and the night tremendous. All the members' carriages were dismissed, and Mrs. Bennet's room at the door was crowded. But Lord North's carriage was waiting. He put into it one or two of his friends whom he had invited to go home with him, and turning to the crowd, chiefly composed of his bitter enemies, in the midst of their triumph, exclaimed, in this hour of defeat and supposed mortification, with admirable good-humor and pleasantry, "I *have* my carriage. You see, gentlemen, the advantage of being in *the secret*. Good-night."

[To resume the extracts from Mr. Adam's papers. Lord Shelburne was sent for by advice of the Chancellor, who was offended with the reception his offers had met with from Lord Rockingham. The first time Lord Shelburne saw the King, was on Thursday (March 21st). He received the message while he was at dinner

with some friends. He immediately left his company, and went to Buckingham House. The interview was long, and Lord Shelburne communicated nothing of what had passed to any of the Rockingham party, though he spent the evening with them in a great party at Devonshire House. To avoid inquiries, he sat down to play at faro; but no one there knew where he had been, except Lord Weymouth and Mr. Rigby, who had seen the Chancellor after the interview.] "I was informed of it," says Mr. Adam, "next morning, between nine and ten o'clock, by Mr. Jenkinson, and between eleven and twelve I called on Lord North, and told him that I had heard such a report, and had reason to believe it to be true, but did not mention my authority." "Lord North," adds Mr. Adam, "was hurt and mortified that he had not been informed of it by the Chancellor."

[The second interview of Lord Shelburne with the King was next day or the day after that. Still no communication with the Rockinghams. On the Sunday, which was the following day, he was again with his Majesty at nine in the morning, and on that day, at one o'clock, his servant was seen at Mr. Fox's door. Mr. Adam adds that in the course of the day Lord Rockingham sent his plan of Administration, but that it required persuasion on the part of his friends to prevail upon him.]

[As Mr. Adam was not at that time in the confidence of either the Rockingham or Shelburne party, the account he gives of the difficulties they had to get over in forming their Administration is derived from common rumor, and not worthy therefore of insertion; he was at that time the intimate friend of Lord North, and consequently hostile to those who were to succeed him.]

Thus ended the Administration of Lord North, and with it the American War.

* We may conclude this period by a review of the memorable events which marked the early periods of Mr. Fox's political life.

The politics of the Court received from him, for a time, a vigorous support; but he soon burst the chains in which he had been confined, and giving loose to his natural genius, displayed at once

the mighty power of his understanding, and the expansive benevolence of his heart.

Mr. Grattan, who had heard Mr. Fox at various epochs, declared his preference for the speeches delivered during the American war to all the other efforts of his eloquence.

The American war was indeed a subject fit to inspire the genius of an orator beyond all other occasions of modern times. The singular folly of the original provocation; the absurdity of renewing the quarrel, when the embers of a former dispute were yet warm; the want of foresight which was exhibited in making concessions always a year or two after the time when they would have been successful in closing the breach; the wretched plan upon which the war was carried on; the extravagance of attempting to conquer America when a French and Spanish fleet rode triumphant in the Channel; the opposition to all wise counsels persisted in till the very members of the Ministry fell off from the body; the animating struggle which at the end made victory doubtful in each successive fight; above all, the immense consequences involved in the contest; all these were circumstances to quicken into life the energies of a great orator.

In reviewing the history of this period, it is impossible not to perceive the blindness and weakness of nearly all the various rulers who succeeded each other in the government of the country.

Mr. Grenville, seeing the progress made by the North American colonies, and their obvious tendency to evade and disregard the British laws, thought to bind them by regulations which could scarcely be enforced in the Thames and the Mersey. Reflecting that seventy millions of debt had been incurred during the Seven Years' war, in securing and extending our American empire, he proposed to make the triumphant and formidable colonists pay one hundred thousand pounds a year to the British revenue!

Lord Rockingham repealed the Stamp Act, but thought it necessary to maintain the right of taxing America. Whatever this right might be as a question of public or national law, it was obvious it could not be exercised with justice or equity; but per-

haps it was not practicable at that time to abandon it, nor do the Americans appear to have resented the barren claim.

The Ministry of Lord Chatham, however, reached the climax of improvidence and absurdity. It had been proved that the attempt to tax America had provoked resistance; it was therefore determined to try a new tax with the certainty of rousing a new resistance. Mr. Grenville had failed in obtaining a substantial revenue from America; it was therefore decided to maintain a tax, for the sake of a tax, for no object but that of a quarrel, when all prospect of revenue had disappeared.

It is due to Lord Chatham to say that the tea-duty was imposed when he was incapable of attending to business. It was afterwards retained, when other taxes were given up, by the Ministry of the Duke of Grafton, against the opinion of the Duke of Grafton himself, of Lord Camden, of Lord Shelburne, and of General Conway.

Surely such a decision, carried by a majority of one in the Cabinet, ought to have opened the eyes of all the Whig members of that Cabinet. It was clear that Lord North, the scion of a Tory family, the inheritor of Tory principles, had inaugurated a Tory Government on the appropriate occasion of enforcing the payment of a tax against justice and against policy, for the purpose of setting up Authority against Liberty.

When Lord North was made First Lord of the Treasury and Chancellor of the Exchequer, there was still time to conciliate America. Lord Chatham would have willingly concurred in any plan by which the right of taxation should be surrendered, and the supremacy of the mother country retained. But neither the King nor his Ministers had the wisdom to make with dignity, and with effect, concessions which they made three years afterwards without dignity and without effect.

It cannot be denied, however, that in his resistance to American claims George III. had the full concurrence of his people. The national pride revolted from any submission to demands loudly put forth, and accompanied with menaces of rebellion.

The further question remains: Had Lord Chatham been called

to the councils of his Sovereign, and had he succeeded by his supreme authority in England, and his wide popularity in America, in reconciling the two nations, would such a result have been permanently advantageous to both?

On the one hand, it may be said that, so long as they kept united, England and America might have led the civilization of the world. Had they forbidden the invasion of France in 1792, that invasion would not have taken place. The fury of the Jacobin party in France, the massacres of the Reign of Terror, the bloody wars of Napoleon, might all have been spared to Europe. A powerful statesman like Mr. Fox, united with Mr. Pitt, might have said to Prussia and to Austria, "You shall not interfere in the internal concerns of France;" and to the French Government, "You shall not invade the territory of any independent state." A minister speaking this language, with the resources of Great Britain, Ireland, and America in his hand, would not have spoken in vain. Europe in 1800 might have enjoyed the blessings which half a century later she reaped from peace and commerce; England would have been spared the burden of seven hundred millions of her National Debt. If at the close of the eighteenth century the union of two such mighty states under one government had been found to be incompatible with the prosperity of the American provinces and the pretensions of American statesmen, the knot might have been gently untied. These great kindred nations, instead of nourishing for two generations sentiments of hatred, resentment, scorn, and antipathy towards each other, might have parted with a mutual desire to pursue by different paths the same end, and to accomplish by different means the great objects of freedom, knowledge, and Christianity.

On the other hand, it must be confessed that the history of the world might have flowed in a different course. The settlement supposed to have been made by Lord Chatham might have been a hollow truce, denounced as soon as the ashes of that great man were deposited in Westminster Abbey. The struggles of Europe during the French Revolution might have aroused America to assert her independence, and republican France might have had in her

contest with England the strenuous aid of republican America. The monarchy of England might have fallen; her independence might scarcely have survived the fatal war.

These things are hidden from our eyes. We can perceive that Lord Chatham, Mr. Fox, and Mr. Burke excelled in wisdom Lord North and Lord Thurlow; but how long the separation of America from the mother country might have been prevented, and in what circumstances it might at last have occurred, are matters on which science must fail, and even speculation must be vague.

BOOK THE FOURTH.

PART THE FIRST.

THE *Memoirs of Walpole* furnish some accounts of the formation of the new Ministry, which, though not in every point to be relied on, agree in the main with the facts derived from other and authentic sources.

"The King, though reduced to the necessity of taking new Ministers, was not at all disposed to add grace to it, nor to smooth his condition by persuading them, whoever they should be, that they were not utterly unwelcome to him. On the contrary, though it was evident that Lord Rockingham was the sole person, who, by his extensive connections and the fairness of his character, could form an Administration of any consistency, that very reason made the King determined not to let the choice fall on him. He would not see the Marquis, but, on the 21st, sent for Lord Shelburne, and offered to place him at the head of the Treasury, which Lord Shelburne not venturing to accept, he made the same offer to Lord Gower with the same success."

"Lord Shelburne, ambitious and impatient as he was to attain that eminence, stood on too narrow a bottom to venture to close with his wishes. Followers of property he had none, or those so inconsiderable that they gave him no weight. The Duke of Grafton was the only peer of consequence with whom he was connected, yet a man who had been Prime Minister was not likely to prove a zealous second, nor was Grafton's temper pliable, or to be relied on. Lord Camden's eloquence, character, and integrity made him by far the most considerable of Lord Shelburne's

friends. Mr. Dunning was a most able lawyer, and Colonel Barré as able a tool; but all these could not form an Administration, or be called a party. I should add, that Lord Shelburne had made most considerable enemies, which Lord Rockingham had not. He had never omitted an occasion of insulting Lord Mansfield, who by marriage had always kept on the fairest terms with Lord Rockingham; and to Lord North, Lord Shelburne's contempt had been so marked, that it exasperated him more than the invectives of Charles Fox."

"Lord Gower, not without a wish of being Premier, was too indolent, or too timid to accept the post; and though he was in a manner, from the nonage of the Duke of Bedford, the head of that connection, it had been so much weakened and split since the death of the late Duke, that Lord Gower was far from sure of commanding it."

"When Lord North was removed, who alone could, from the pleasantry of his humor, the attachment of the Tories, and the fairness of his private character, have kept the Administration so long together, Lord Rockingham was the next who could bring the largest accession of landed property, nobility, and popularity of character to the support of Government. Indeed, in point of character, there were very few politicians in England who possessed any character of integrity or disinterestedness at all, but the chiefs of that connection, as the Cavendishes, Sir G. Savile, Frederick Montague, and others. The Duke of Richmond, though so eminently virtuous, was not popular, and General Conway, immaculate as the whitest of them, would never enlist in any faction, nor allow any to call him theirs."

"This summary is so true, that Lord Shelburne himself was aware of it, and, reporting the King's offer to him to Lord Rockingham, said, 'My lord, you could stand without me, but I could not without you.' This was, perhaps, the justest reflection Shelburne ever made in his life, and had he not forgotten it, he might have mollified the indisposition of Lord Rockingham's friends towards him, and succeeded to Lord Rockingham's power—I

mean succeeded with stability. But forgetting his own reflection, he converted his allies into bitter enemies."

"The King, defeated as he was, could not bear to submit, nor did the rest yield with the facility of Lord North. It was given out, to encourage steadiness in others, that the Duke of Montague had offered to resign his place of Master of the Horse, if it would accommodate his Majesty in acquiring a friend. It was thought that the King saw Lord Bute[1] on that occasion; for Mackenzie he certainly sent; and the last, and Wedderburne, had very private interviews with the Chancellor, though great hostility had passed between the latter and Wedderburne. When *they* could meet, it was evident how very distasteful it would be to the Court to admit a Whig Administration."—H. W.

"When the King could form no corps strong enough to exclude the Opposition, he again sent for Lord Shelburne [and had another private communication with him]. Shelburne sent word to Lord Rockingham that he had been with the King, but would not disclose what passed, as it would only exasperate Lord Rockingham more—as if that softened it!" "Shelburne, in the mean time, made a most bitter invective in the House of Lords against the Lords North and Stormont—an absurd impolicy to exasperate more part of the Court, into which he was going to fling himself!"

"In short, not to dwell on days and hours, the King consented to take Lord Rockingham and his lordship's arrangements, but—is that credible?—would not see him. All was transacted by the medium of Lord Shelburne. He carried the messages backwards and forwards. Lord Rockingham was indignant, but his friends persuaded him to bear it, and when all the changes were settled, on the 27th, Lord Rockingham was admitted to an audience of the King, and accepted the Administration."

[1] Whatever was thought, I believe, nay, I think I know, that he did not, either on that or any other occasion, after the formation of the Rockingham Administration in 1765, except once, and then it was by the contrivance of the Princess Dowager at Kew, without the King's previous knowledge and with his subsequent displeasure.—V. H.

"The new Cabinet consisted of Marquis of Rockingham as First Lord of the Treasury; Lord J. Cavendish, Chancellor of the Exchequer [most reluctantly as he professed]; Lord Shelburne and Charles Fox, Secretaries of State; Lord Camden, President of the Council; Duke of Grafton, Privy Seal; General Conway, Commander-in-Chief; Admiral Keppel, First Lord of Admiralty; Duke of Richmond, Ordnance;[1] and Dunning, made a peer, Chancellor of the Duchy. With this entirely new Cabinet, joined the old Chancellor, Thurlow, whose abilities the new Ministers thought too considerable to drive into Opposition."

"If Lord Shelburne had waved the first post, he proved that he at least shared the power. Besides two great posts for Lord Camden and Duke of Grafton, he got a peerage for Dunning, created Lord Ashburton, with the Duchy of Lancaster, and a pension of 4000*l.* per annum. Colonel Barré was made Treasurer of the Navy, a post destined for the Lord Advocate Dundas; nor was that all he did for Colonel Barré, as will soon appear; nor was his share of the Cabinet inconsiderable, by his own vote and those of the Duke of Grafton, Lords Camden and Ashburton, not to mention that having more of the King's favor than Lord Rockingham, the Chancellor, it was likely, would incline the same way."—H. W.

Walpole relates the grant of three garters to Dukes of Richmond, and Devonshire, and Lord Shelburne—to the disappoint-

[1] The Duke of Richmond refused to accept unless the King would say he had no objection to him, to which the King had assented, though the Duke and Charles Fox were the two he had most wished to exclude. As the Duke's friend, I earnestly wished him to support and act vigorously with the new Administration, but to take nothing. It would have placed him in a high light, and silenced much clamor, nor do I think I could have condescended to accept a post under a prince whom I had taxed with breaking his word with me. I am persuaded he did not accept the Ordnance for the emoluments, but from activity and love of business, and from thinking he could correct abuses, which he did very soon with indefatigable industry; I was as little pleased with his taking the Garter. It is so easy for a Duke of Richmond to have it, that I thought he would be more distinguished by neglecting it.—H. W.

ment of Lord Dartmouth and Lord Ashburnham, to whom the King had promised them. Lord Dartmouth acquiesced, Lord Ashburnham was indignant, though the latter's place was preserved for him, while Lord Hertford, Lord Beauchamp, and many other courtiers lost theirs—"by which," says Walpole, "what the King lost the country gained; for courtiers perceived that royal amity was no insurance of their places, and returned to the old style of connecting themselves with Ministers."

He then mentions the two peerages, one to Keppel, and the other to Howe, censures the favors bestowed on the Howes, to whom "no party owed gratitude;" and adds—

"Many to whom distinctions were due, Lord Rockingham had not the power of serving. Mr. Burke's reforming bill, which had saved but a trifle to the public, distressed his party by cutting off many small places. Thus the new Administration was very narrow, though in general more popular than could be expected, considering how much the nation had been set against them on the false accusation of their supporting the Americans, though the truth was, the Americans, so far from thinking themselves supported by them, looked on themselves as abandoned."

"There was one of the former Administration who might have been saved, if he had pleased—Lord Carlisle. Charles Fox and he had been intimate from school, and in the height of Fox's extravagance and distress from gaming debts, Lord Carlisle had been bound for him. Fox, mindful of his obligations, had obtained to have Lord Carlisle left Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland; but the latter, warm and haughty as any Howard could be, and prompted by his secretary, Eden, who had devoted himself to Lord North, no sooner heard of the revolution than he sent over his resignation, and demanded to be recalled. This vacancy accommodated Lord Rockingham, who immediately dispatched the Duke of Portland to take the government of Ireland."

Lord Weymouth was made Groom of the Stole at Lord Shelburne's recommendation, and with Lord Rockingham's acquiescence. Walpole adds: "The late Court were so secure of Shelburne's disposition to them, that the Lord Advocate [Dundas] said to Lord

North, 'You should not let your friends abuse Shelburne, for he is ours;' but North was not at all disposed to cement that union."

"One promising young man in the Opposition the public expected to see advanced—William Pitt; but he refused all preferment. What was offered to him I do not know, nor whether any post was specified."

"I have said that the new Ministers either would not or could not pass so much as a censure on their very criminal predecessors. They were more passive still, for they endured rewards to be heaped on two of the most guilty. Lord North retired with a pension of 4000*l.* per annum; and Robinson, Secretary of the Treasury, and, from Lord North's indolence, a principal agent in all business, had another pension of 1000*l.* Charles Fox, it is true, inveighed bitterly in the House of Commons against the former, and Sawbridge moved for a question on both. Robinson pleaded poverty, and affected it by letting his house and selling his coach-horses, though, till questioned, he had displayed great opulence, and had just given his daughter, with a large fortune, to Lord Abergavenny's eldest son; but the motion was defeated by the previous question."

April 4. "There was a meeting of the Associators at York. They agreed to trust the new Ministers, at least for the present, and adjourned for a year to give them a fair trial. A principal inducement to this temper was that the Duke of Richmond, who had given in to the wildest visions of the right of every man to vote for representatives, had extorted an unwilling engagement from his fellows, the other Ministers, that a committee of the House of Commons should be appointed to examine, and, if they could agree on any system (which was most unlikely, in such a chaos of opinions and interests, which last are opinions), to settle a new and juster mode of representation; an engagement diverted by the subsequent schisms, and forgotten in the flat rejection of the demands of the Associations."

April 8. "The new Ministers being rechosen, the House of Commons met again, when, instead of any crimination produced by them against any of their predecessors, an attempt was made to embarrass the Ministers by a deed that, though aimed at them,

might have produced the most mischievous consequences and confusions to the nation. Eden, Lord Carlisle's secretary, had posted over with the Earl's resignation. So exasperated was he that, not only keeping himself private, he had secret intercourse with and private incitement from, Lord Loughborough, but he positively *refused* to communicate a syllable of the state of Ireland to Lord Shelburne, the Secretary of State. On the contrary, Colonel Lutterell, an ominous name, instigated probably by Loughborough and Eden, rose as soon as the House met, and called on the Ministers to declare what measures they meant to pursue for pacifying the disquiets and alarms of Ireland, not yet satisfied that what had been done for her was either substantial or irrevocable. On this hostile ground mounted Eden, and in a passionate speech, ill covered over with pretended zeal, called for a repeal of the act of George I., which was the most grievous link of their chain of subjection. Unfortunately for this incendiary, a spear, like that of Milton's angel, that touching Satan made him start up in his proper shape, was in the hand of Charles Fox. His vehement eloquence, that had so often borne down Lord North, Sandwich, and the late Junto, was now displayed in detecting and exposing the mischievous conduct of Eden, while with the utmost address and discretion he steered clear of any offence to Ireland. He overwhelmed Eden with shame—not with remorse—for though universal indignation burst on the head of Eden, his obstinate pride would not recant, nor would he withdraw his motion until General Conway, as powerful in indignant virtue as Fox in the thunder of abilities, threatened him with a vote of censure, which was re-echoed by an hundred voices, when, more terrified than abashed, he submitted to waive his purpose."

"Soon after the return of Lord Carlisle died Earl Talbot, the Lord Steward, who had been left in his post from the nearness of his approaching dissolution. The new Ministers had been able to find but few places for many peers who had long supported them in Opposition. The King had saved some beyond the two that he had been indulged to protect, as the Duke of Dorset and Lord Oxford. Yet was not one of the new Minister's friends

thought on for the Steward's wand. Lord Shelburne, who was seeking to fortify himself against the Rockingham division by potent friends, offered the stick to the Duke of Marlborough, and, though the Duke declined it, gained him. Charles Fox, not thinking his debt of gratitude yet paid, solicited for Lord Carlisle, and procured him to be appointed Lord Steward."

We must now have recourse to other sources for letters and papers illustrative of the internal state of the Ministry.

[On the 12th of April, Mr. Fox writes to Fitzpatrick:] "We had a Cabinet this morning, in which, in my opinion, there were more symptoms of what we had always apprehended, than had ever hitherto appeared. The subject was Burke's bill, or rather the message introductory to it. Nothing was concluded, but in Lord Chancellor there was so marked an opposition, and in your brother-in-law[1] so much inclination to help the Chancellor, that we got into something very like a warm debate. I told them I was determined to bring the matter to a crisis, as I am, and I think a few days will convince them that they must yield entirely. If they do not, we must go to war again, that is all; I am sure I am ready. Lord Camden is entirely with us, but seems to have a horrible apprehension of debates or divisions amongst ourselves. Conway, I am afraid, is likely to be caught with the idea of the King's doing part of the business without an Act of Parliament, which is not so very objectionable in itself, but as it makes a considerable delay before the thing appears in public, and delay will possibly be interpreted lukewarmness in us by any persons who are at all suspicious. Therefore, this idea I think very insidious, and we must guard against it. The King appears more and more good-humored every day, and I believe is really pleased with the full levees and drawing-rooms, which he sees every day, and which he thinks flattering to him; perhaps I am deceived in this, but I really think so. He either is, or pretends to be, very angry with your predecessor,[2] but seemed very anxious that Carlisle should feel as he ought on that subject. I only mention this to show the *ton* he takes with us."

[1] Lord Shelburne.

[2] Mr. Eden.

[On the 15th, he writes again:] "We have had another very teasing and wrangling Cabinet; but I rather think everything is or will be settled right. I am to carry a message to-day to the House of Commons, which looks and points to Burke's bill. The King is, in the first instance, to abolish of his own accord the offices; but that abolition is, in every instance, to have the sanction of an Act of Parliament for the appropriation of the money, the preventing their revival, &c. Lord Chancellor, as you may imagine, dislikes it. Lord S.[1] seems more *bothered* about it than anything else, does not understand it, but, in conjunction with Lord Ashburton, rather throws difficulties in its way. General Conway quite with us in the general view, but unfortunately *doubts* in almost every particular instance. Lord Camden, evidently with us in his mind, yet is so terribly afraid of dissensions that he does not do us all the good he might. The Duke of Grafton rather hostile, though professing *right principles* in the strongest terms, but full of little projects of his own, and troublesome in the extreme; the remaining five[2] just as you would expect and wish. This is a tolerably accurate sketch of our councils, but I have no doubt but things will jumble themselves into something more to our mind, or come to a crisis the other way. Indeed, if they do not, it will be very uneasy to me, and to everybody. We met yesterday at eleven, and did not get to the drawing-room till four, when it was over. All this time the King seems in perfect good-humor, and does not seem to make any of those difficulties which others make for him."

[On the 28th, he says]: "With respect to affairs here, they are really in such a state as is very difficult to describe; I feel them to be worse than they were, and yet I do not know what particular circumstance to state as the cause of this feeling. Shelburne shows himself more and more every day, is ridiculously jealous of my encroaching on his department, and wishes

[1] Lord Shelburne.

[2] The "remaining five" were Lord Rockingham, the Duke of Richmond, Lord John Cavendish, Admiral Keppel, and Mr. Fox himself.

very much to encroach upon mine. He hardly liked my having a letter from Grattan, or my having written one to Lord Charlemont. He affects the Minister more and more every day, and is, I believe, perfectly confident that the King intends to make him so. Provided we can stay in long enough to have given a good stout blow to the influence of the Crown, I do not think it much signifies how soon we go out after, and leave him and the Chancellor to make such a Government as they can, and this I think we shall be able to do."

[On the 1st May, he gives an account of the debate in the Lords on the Contractors' Bill:] "We have to-night carried the Contractors' Bill in the House of Lords, by a majority of 67 to 39. The Chancellor began the opposition, and was not satisfied with speaking his opinion, but called on the Lords, who had formerly been against it, to stand by their former votes, and in short, spoke as violently and hostilely as it is possible to conceive. The Duke of Richmond answered him, and there was a good deal of sparring between them, in which the Duke of Richmond had notoriously the advantage. Lord Camden spoke extraordinarily well, and declared the fate of the Ministry depended upon that of the Bill. Lord Gower spoke against us, but declared himself shaken in some degree by Lord Camden's argument, for that all the hopes of the country were in the abilities, &c., of the present Ministers, to whom he paid many compliments. Only four bishops were with us, viz., Peterborough, St. Asaph, Carlisle, and Lichfield (Lord Cornwallis's brother). Three Scotch peers, viz., Lothian, Aberdeen, and Roseberry. Lord Carlisle did not stay, but will, I believe, be with us, and be Lord Steward to-morrow. I wait for a messenger to tell you all that has passed upon this subject; but he is in good-humor, and likely, perhaps, to be more with *us* than you can conceive. I am sure we are, as things now stand, absolutely bound to support him, with regard to the Steward's place; and if we are not able, we ought to be no longer Ministers. Shelburne paid compliments to the Chancellor, which very much scandalized all good men."

We now return to Walpole.

April 15. On King's Message on economy, "Burke in the Commons, and Lord Shelburne in the Lords, were ridiculously extravagant in panegyrics on his Majesty for this magnanimity, which certainly was no measure of his, but an artifice of their own, and but a shallow one, to persuade the people that they meant to adhere to their former principles, while their flattery was rather a symptom that they would not."

"I have said that the new Ministers were distressed for want of places, to satisfy their friends; yet to the honor of their party it should be told, that neither at this period, nor that of the ensuing year, did they lose many from want of power to serve them. The party not only saw that it was not their fault, but that the King did all he could to add to their embarrassments, by withholding whatever he could. In these difficulties, Lord Rockingham behaved with more zeal and decency than Lord Shelburne. An instance of the latter's impolitic insensibility appeared in the case of Lord Cholmondeley—and in fact, artful as Lord Shelburne affected to be, it is certain that his art was so clumsy, so gross, so ill-timed, and so contradictory to itself, that he could not have fallen as soon as he did, if he had had no art at all. Lord Cholmondeley had peculiarly attached himself to him. Not being able to provide for him, instead of excusing himself, he congratulated Lord Cholmondeley on remaining independent, which was felt as an insult.[1] I have mentioned his flattery to the King. He went

[1] Lord Cholmondeley had much impaired his fortune by dice and dissipation, and though an associate of Mr. Fox and his friends, had thought it a better game to attach himself in politics to Lord Shelburne. From some motive, possibly from no unreasonable apprehension that, in case of a rupture with his colleagues, Cholmondeley's habits and friendships might outweigh his political professions and attachments, Lord Shelburne preferred providing for Lord Tankerville to securing Lord Cholmondeley; and he took a method of reconciling the latter to his lot, which showed that he had no great knowledge of his character, or address in adapting his topics to it. He attempted to talk him over by recommending the "grand independent line," to live "like a respectable nobleman," to "marry a little," and many other phrases, which Cholmondeley, who had no taste for greatness, independence, respectability, marriage, or the like,

farther, and told the Chancellor that he was amazed at the genius he found in the King! The Chancellor laughed in his face, and instead of reporting it to the King, as Shelburne expected, told it to everybody else with contempt."

May 3. "The Middlesex election was at last rescinded. Charles Fox, who had always opposed that correction, made a most manly and fair defence of himself on that occasion."—H. W.

Walpole, on the 5th of May, writes in a letter to Sir Horace Mann: "Mr. Fox already shines as greatly in place as he did in Opposition, though infinitely more difficult a task. He is now as indefatigable as he was idle. He has perfect temper, and not only good-humor, but good-nature; and, which is the first quality in a Prime Minister of a free country, has more common sense than any man, with amazing parts that are neither ostentatious nor affected. Lord North had wit and good-humor, but neither temper, nor feeling, nor activity, nor good breeding. Lord Chatham was a blazing meteor, that scattered war with success, but sunk to nothing in peace. Perhaps I am partial to Charles Fox, because he resembles my father in good sense; I wish he had his excellent constitution, too. Yet his application to business may preserve his life, which his former dissipation constantly endangered."—H. W.

Walpole lost his notes of what passed in the rest of Lord Rockingham's Administration, but adds, "The material [features of the Administration] were the masterly abilities of Charles Fox, and the intrigues of Lord Shelburne; the former displayed such facility in comprehending and executing all business, as charmed all approached him. No formal affectation delayed any service,

scarcely understood, though he thought it for a season very fine. When, however, Hare, Charles Fox, and Fitzpatrick heard his report, and he from their comments collected that he should "get nothing from Shelburne and be laughed at by them," he waxed as furious as his nature could be, but being very good-humored, as well as very shabby and interested, he could not help laughing himself at the ridiculous figure he made, and has related it more than once to me as well as to others.—V. H.

or screened ignorance. *He seized at once the important points of every affair, and every affair was thence reduced within a small compass*, not to save himself trouble, for he at once *gave himself up to the duties of his office.*[1] *His good-humor, frankness, and sincerity pleased, and yet inspired a respect, which he took no other pains to attract.* The foreign ministers were in admiration of him: they had found few who understood foreign affairs, or who attended to them, and no man *who understood French so well, or could explain himself in so few words.*"—H. W.

"While Fox thus *unfolded his character so advantageously*, Shelburne was busied in devoting himself to the King, and in traversing Lord Rockingham and Fox in every point. If *they opened a negotiation, he commenced another underhand at the same court.* Mr. Fox dispatched Thomas Grenville to Paris. Lord Shelburne sent one, two, or three privately to the same place, and addressed them to different Ministers or persons of supposed credit."—H. W.

On the 7th of May, Fox writes to Fitzpatrick: "William Pitt moved for a committee upon representation to-day. The House is just up. For the motion 141, against it 161, so that we are beat, though Lord John, &c., all voted with us. The country gentlemen were against us, Powys, Marsham, &c."

[Sketches of the impressions made by an important debate are generally interesting, and the reader may like to see a short account of this debate from a letter of General Burgoyne to Mr. Fitzpatrick, of the 8th of May:] "We had yesterday a strange day, upon Pitt's motion for an inquiry into the representation; friend against friend among us: on the other side, the late Ministry voted in phalanx, Lord North and Robinson excepted, who were absent; Burke retired quite against us in opinion; Powys

[1] He never touched a card, and was, during all his three short Administrations (till his fatal illness), assiduous in his duties, yet never troublesome or harsh to those under him, nor unnecessarily busy or meddling, in little matters—a fault in office as frequent and as mischievous as indolence.—V. H.

was against us; T. Pitt violently so, and took the lead in the Opposition. The Advocate spoke long, ill for him, but offensively against Charles. He seems to have taken up that line of late. Charles in his very first form, and Sheridan much above anything he has yet done in the House: I think I never heard more wit than part of his speech against the Advocate. We lost the question by 20."

[Mr. Burke was prevailed upon to absent himself from this discussion; but in a subsequent debate he appears to have expressed himself warmly, if not violently, on the general question.] "On Friday last [says Sheridan to Fitzpatrick in a letter of the 20th of May], "Burke acquitted himself with the most magnanimous indiscretion, attacked W. Pitt in a scream of passion, and swore Parliament was and always had been precisely what it ought to be, and that all people who thought of reforming it wanted to overturn the constitution." [The occasion for making this speech was the motion of Alderman Sawbridge for shortening the duration of Parliaments.]

The following letter of Mr. Fox, written on the 11th of May, exhibits the progress of dissension and mutual alienation in the Ministry; and if on the one hand it shows how Mr. Fox could be mistaken in his estimate of character, on the other hand it places in a favorable point of view his political foresight and sagacity. "With respect to things here, many unpleasant circumstances have happened this week. Our having been beat upon Pitt's motion will, in my opinion, produce many more bad consequences than many people seem to suppose, among which the kind of spirit and confidence which it has given to the old Ministerialists is perhaps not the least. The very thin attendances which appear on most occasions are very disheartening and sometimes embarrassing to me. Upon the bill for securing Sir Thomas Rumbold's property, we were only 36 to 33. The Attorney and Solicitor-General were both against me, and I had the mortification to depend for support upon Lord-Advocate, Jenkinson, and Mansfield. The first of these, upon Pitt's motion, chose to speak in the most offensive manner to me personally, by marking, in the most

pointed way, the different opinion he entertained of the purity of Pitt's intentions and of mine. I know most people think that he has taken ill some things that I have said, and that all this is only warmth in consequence; but I own I cannot help suspecting that he means to show that he does not consider me as a person who has power to hurt him, and that he is very well with those who have; for he always calls himself a supporter of the present Government, and has, I am pretty sure, established a sort of connection with your brother-in-law. Lord Rockingham's illness, which is now over, has prevented me from bringing this matter to the crisis to which it must come, and shall come, if I am to remain the King's Minister in the House of Commons. You will easily perceive by this letter that I am out of humor, and you know me enough to know I am not inclined to be so without reason." [He adds afterwards:] "I have given you but a small part of the cause of my ill-humor, when I have confined myself to the House of Commons. The House of Lords has been the most shameful scene you can imagine. The Duke of Richmond, in points where he was clearly right, has been deserted by every Minister present more than once. Lord Rockingham and Lord Keppel were absent."

"Carlisle received the staff on Sunday, and is, I believe, in perfect good-humor. The history of that transaction is a most curious one. Lord Rockingham offered; Lord Carlisle, after some time to consider, accepts; and then Lord S. says, he had thought of it for the Duke of Marlborough, and that something at least must be done for Lord Charles Spencer before this matter is settled. I talked to him very roundly upon this affair, and of course he and his friend gave way, and the thing was done, only less graciously than it ought. In short, everything that we apprehended upon this subject is true even beyond our apprehensions; it must be our business to preserve our credit and character, which I think we cannot lose [but] by our own faults, and which is *most clearly indeed* all that we have to stand upon. *He* thinks, I know he does, that he has other ground. How it will bear him, *il faut voir*. That he will not delay long trying it I very much believe,

especially if we should be fortunate enough to make a peace, which I do not wish for less ardently than I did, although I am convinced that in signing it I shall sign the end of this Ministry. *Faisons notre devoir, arrive qui pourra*, is the maxim which prudence as well as honesty must dictate to us. You recommended me to keep up my attention to two great political persons, and I have, I do assure you, spared no pains to follow your advice. With respect to the first in rank of the two, I have succeeded to my utmost hopes, so much so, that if we fail in his object, I am sure he will be rather displeased at others than at us. I like him better every day; he is natural, open, and remarkably free, at least as far as I can judge, from those meannesses which from his blood and his situation might be expected.[1] I wish I could say I was quite as well satisfied in regard to the other person, who is perhaps the most material of the two. He is very civil and obliging, profuse of compliments in public; but he has more than once taken a line that has alarmed me, especially when he dissuaded against going into any inquiries that might produce heats and differences.[2] This seemed so unlike his general mode of thinking, and so like that of another, that I confess I disliked it to the greatest degree. I am satisfied he will be the man that the old system, revived in the person of Lord S., will attempt to bring forward for its support. I am satisfied he is incapable of giving into this with his eyes open; but how he may be led into it step by step is more than I can answer for. I feel myself, I own, rather inclined to rely upon his understanding and integrity for resisting all the temptations of ambition, and especially *of being first*, which I know will be industriously thrown in his way, and contrasted with that secondary and subordinate situation to which they will insinuate he must be confined while he continues to act in the general system."

[On the 18th, he writes to Mr. Fitzpatrick:] "Nothing has happened much to alter my opinion from what is contained in my letter of this day se'nnight; Lord Scarborough's death has occa-

[1] I confess I am at a loss to say who this is.

[2] Mr. Pitt.

sioned another little *manège*, just like that about the Steward's staff, and I foresee it will end as that did. Lord Robert will have it, but he will have it the latter end of *next* week, instead of the beginning of this as he ought to have had it. Indeed, if every vacancy that happens is to occasion as much negotiation as these two have done, it will be a pleasant business for those who have, or ought to have, the disposal of them."

[Another short letter from Mr. Fox to Mr. Fitzpatrick, while the latter remained in Ireland, has been preserved; but it contains no allusion to domestic politics, and as Mr. Fitzpatrick returned to England in the middle of June, their correspondence was necessarily brought to a close. In the absence of other information, it may therefore be worth while to insert the following letter from Mr. Hare, because it shows the view taken of Mr. Fox's position by one of his most intelligent and confidential friends. After mentioning the change in Mr. Fox's mode of life, his seldom looking in at Brookes's and never dining there, and humorously describing the disappointment of those who had paid up arrears of four or five years' subscription, that they might enjoy the society of a Minister, he goes on to say:] "The Advocate has, on so many occasions, shown such hostility, mixed with a great degree of arrogance, if not impertinence, towards Charles, that Charles, with all his good-nature and forbearance, has been rather exasperated against him. I thought it proceeded from the Advocate's being out of humor at the late reverse in his fortunes, and apt to take offence when none was meant; but Charles suspected it was a concerted scheme between the Advocate and a friend of yours, whom I need not name. Charles sent a civil message to the Advocate by the Duke of Buccleugh, and he returned a very general, vague answer, which convinced Charles that his suspicion was founded. I literally have not spoken to Charles for some days, and do not know whether anything more has passed; but when I last talked with Charles, he was determined that, if the Advocate persisted in this improper behavior, he should be turned out, or that he, Charles, would go out. What made this conduct in the Advocate more alarming was that William Pitt, one day after Charles had

declared the state of the nation to be in all respects more distressful than he had imagined, and the conduct of the late Ministers more culpable in rejecting all offers of mediation or neglecting all overtures of peace, and after he had declared that these things must be inquired into; William Pitt agreed with the Advocate, who had objected to any inquiry, on the pretence that it would cause altercation, revive animosity, and take up too much of the time of Ministers, and he totally differed from Charles in everything that he had said on the subject. This circumstance very much increased our suspicion that the Advocate's hostility was systematical, and concocted not a hundred miles from Berkeley Square. Since I wrote this I have seen Charles, who has received a message from the Advocate by Lord Maitland, to assure him that he never meant any incivility to him, and that on the contrary he was the person amongst his Majesty's Ministers to whom he bore the most entire good-will. We shall see how he will act up to these professions in public. The moment Lord Scarborough was dead, Lord Rockingham wrote to the King at Windsor to recommend Lord Robert Spencer for his place, but received for answer that it had better be given to Lord Charles. Lord Rockingham persists for Lord Robert, and Lord Shelburne will certainly fail getting it for Lord Charles, by which means he flattered himself he should lay the Duke of Marlborough under an obligation. They must come to some explicit agreement about patronage and recommendations to places, for, besides the ill-will that this competition excites, the time of the Cabinet is as much taken up in settling the Vice-treasuryship as the kingdom of Ireland. You have seen by the papers that the Chancellor opposed the contractors' and the Cricklade bills. Crewe's bill was in the House of Lords yesterday, and he said he should reserve his opposition to it for the third reading, but that if anybody wished to divide against it in that stage he was ready. He intends likewise to oppose the bill for restraining Sir T. Rumboldt from leaving the kingdom, and from concealing or alienating any part of his property—in short, to oppose everything that is attempted by the new Government. Irish affairs come on in both Houses to-mor-

row, and I shall not be surprised if he endeavors to work mischief; but if he does, I hope they will see the necessity of turning him out."

[No further correspondence has been preserved that carries on the history of these dissensions to the end of the Rockingham Administration, but that they continued unabated to the last, is clear both from Fitzpatrick's journal, and from the letters of General Burgoyne and of the Duke of Portland, written to Mr. Fox before they were aware of his resignation. General Burgoyne, in a letter of the 5th of July, after describing the deep affliction of the Duke of Portland on the intelligence of Lord Rockingham's death, and his "apprehensions from the present state of the Cabinet," suggests him as a fit person to succeed that nobleman in the Treasury, as well as in the principal lead of the party; and concludes by saying to Mr. Fox:] "Upon an occasion, which seems to threaten a speedy dissolution of the Administration, I cannot refrain from repeating (though I think it unnecessary) my devotion, my invaluable friend, to your fortunes, and there will be no sacrifices in my sphere that will not be made with pleasure when thought necessary." [The Duke of Portland writes on the following day:] "You will not be surprised at my not being able to write to you yesterday. I received the fatal letter on Thursday evening, and have scarcely now recovered that state of composure which is necessary for the arrangement of my thoughts. Little time or consideration, however, are requisite for directing our conduct in the present critical and important moment. Confidence I conceive to be wholly out of the question; power must be taken as its substitute, and unless you can possess that, and convince the public of your possessing it, both your honor and duty to the country dictate your retreat. My opinion may possibly and indeed may most probably be too late, for I cannot but suppose upon recollection that the fate of Administration is by this time decided. I own I tremble for the event, because I see inevitable and complete ruin, the consequence of the restoration of the late system. I thank you sincerely for your letter of the 28th. The event it announced the probability of has

been long (comparatively with your political existence) expected by me; and my ideas of its having happened will appear by the direction of this letter to you in your *private* capacity. If Richard brings me the account I expect, I suppose there can be no impropriety in my applying for a release in peremptory terms, and that I may consider myself at liberty as soon as the session is concluded."

[NEGOTIATIONS FOR PEACE.]

[Before proceeding to the breaking up of the Rockingham Administration, it will be necessary to revert to the negotiations for peace, in which Mr. Fox was incessantly and actively engaged during the short period he remained in office. When the Rockingham party came into power, Great Britain was engaged in hostilities, not only with her revolted colonies, but with France, Spain, and Holland, and was embarrassed besides by the pretensions of the armed neutrality, to which most of the non-belligerent powers had given their accession. France and the United States were bound by treaty not to make peace separately. Spain and Holland had not acknowledged the United States, and had contracted no engagements with them. The first object of Mr. Fox was to open a separate negotiation with Holland, through the mediation of Russia. At a Cabinet Council, held on the 28th of March, the day after the Ministry came into office, the following minute was agreed to:[1]]

"*Present:*—Lord Chancellor, President, Lord Privy Seal, Duke of Richmond, Lord Rockingham, Lord Shelburne, Lord Ashburton, General Conway, Admiral Keppel, Mr. Fox, Lord John Cavendish.

"It is humbly recommended to his Majesty to direct Mr. Fox to acquaint M. Simolin that the King is willing to enter into treaty of peace with Holland, upon the footing of free navigation, according to the treaty of 1764, and that for the purpose of facilitating such treaty his Majesty is willing to agree to the imme-

[1] From a copy in the handwriting of Mr. Fox.

diate cessation of hostilities, if that should be deemed an expedient measure by their High Mightinesses."

[This offer seems to have been communicated to the Dutch government by M. Simolin (the Russian Minister in London), without waiting for instructions from St. Petersburg; for, on the 12th of April, it was known to Dr. Franklin, at Paris,[1] and on the same day Mr. Fox writes to Mr. Fitzpatrick:] "You will have seen how handsomely the Russians have supported my offer. People here are very sanguine about peace with Holland; *I doubt.*" This doubt was but too well founded. On the 21st of April he writes again to Mr. Fitzpatrick, "No chance, I fear, of peace with Holland."]

[When this proposal was first conveyed to the Empress, she seems to have entered into it with eagerness. On the 21st of May the King writes to Mr. Fox:[2]] "Undoubtedly, the appearances in Russia are as favorable on the Dutch affairs as the most sanguine mind could expect, and the levity of the Court alone gives distrust as to the final issue. I have also some fear that Mr. Grenville's negotiation at Paris will cause some disgust, as the joint mediation at Vienna is one of her favorite projects." [But the good offices of the Empress seem to have been accompanied by proposals to which his Majesty was not prepared to accede. On the 15th of June the King writes to Mr. Fox:] "There is no doubt but the Empress of Russia seems to continue in better humor; but there are points in the communication of so serious a nature—and that must affect so much in futurity—that I am certain Mr. Fox must see the propriety of laying this dispatch of Sir James Harris before the Cabinet before he offers me any opinion on the subject, and, consequently, takes any step in it and in the communication M. de Simolin will make."

[Accordingly, on the 26th of June a Cabinet was held, and the following minute agreed upon]:[3]

[1] Franklin's Works, by Sparks, ix. 206.

[2] In the handwriting of George III.

[3] From a copy in the handwriting of Mr. Fox.

"*Present*—Lord Chancellor, Lord President, Lord Privy Seal, Duke of Richmond, Lord Shelburne, Lord John Cavendish, Lord Keppel, Lord Ashburton, General Conway, Mr. Fox.

"It is humbly recommended to his Majesty to direct Mr. Fox to acquaint M. Simolin that his Majesty is desirous of entering fully into the ideas of the Empress, and to form the closest connections with the Court of Petersburg, and that his Majesty is willing to make the principles of her Imperial Majesty's declaration of the 28th February, 1780, the basis of a treaty between the two countries.

"It is further humbly recommended to his Majesty to direct Mr. Fox to acquaint M. Simolin with the substance of the instructions to Mr. Grenville, as the best method of letting the Court of Petersburg know that ultimatum which she asks."

[That the answer returned did not meet the wishes of the Court of St. Petersburg appears from the private letter sent with it from Mr. Fox to Sir James Harris.]

St. James's, *June* 29, 1782.

"Dear Sir:—

"I return you many thanks for your private letter, which perfectly convinced me, but unfortunately not others, so that the answer is as you will see; however, it is not such a one as to offend, and I have endeavored in the manner to make it such as to keep up the good disposition at your Court. I hope you will endeavor to represent it as like a complete complaisance as the thing will bear.[1] I shall send a courier in a few days.

"I am,

"Dear sir, yours ever,

"C. J. FOX."

[The reply of Sir James Harris to this private communication did not reach England till Mr. Fox was out of office. It is nevertheless worth while to preserve it, as it contains the opinion of a

[1] Cipher.

very able diplomatist on the expediency at that moment of our acknowledging the principles of the armed neutrality.]

[PRIVATE.] "PETERSBURG, *July*, 1782.

"DEAR SIR:—

"I have many thanks to return you for your private letter of the 29th of June. You encourage me to be prolix (perhaps troublesome) and officious. I had great satisfaction in hearing you approve what I had written relative to the expediency of a recognition of the principles of the armed neutrality. Besides the immediate advantages to be derived from a measure so very flattering to the Empress, I am convinced, in my own mind, that such a recognition would contribute to annul the ill effects of this new-fangled doctrine, and that a perseverance on our part to oppose is the surest method of giving it permanency and consistency.

"It is in itself so contrary to the Czarina's ideas of self-defence, that none of the members of the league (particularly Russia) ever can possibly adhere to its principles, if engaged in a maritime war, and we, it is hoped, never shall again find ourselves in the same isolated situation we now stand in.

"The Dutch and Portuguese already enjoy by treaty this free trade. The Danes are tied up by the explanatory article; and the remaining maritime states cannot, from the diversity of their interests, ever reap any advantage from it in a future day; and it is impossible that Russia and Sweden, Prussia and Austria, should not act against each other if once a system is established in Europe, and the establishment of such a system seems now to be a general wish.

"It may be observed, too, that all the powers in Europe unitedly enjoy at this moment—in fact, if not by right—the privileges we deny them. They have all subscribed to the neutral league, and it is idle for us to dispute its validity. We may indeed contest its equity, but we must submit to the law it imposes. I again, too, repeat, that it will acquire vigor and duration from persecution; and, as I was sure at first that we might, by a well-

timed compliance, have stifled it in its infancy, I am now satisfied we should, in a great measure, stop its growth, by a frank and unconditional acquiescence. A new order of things would arise, and this production vanish, and necessarily fall to the ground, in the formation of a more rational and salutary system.

"I must add that the Empress is equally irritable and obstinate on this point; that it is the sheet-anchor of our adversaries, and the only hold they have left. As long as we oppose it, a perpetual motive of discontent will exist between the two courts. I shall never be able to produce any good, and all my endeavors must be employed to prevent evil.

"I should think the most advisable mode of avowing these principles, if his Majesty consents to it, is by an act of accession to the neutral league with the Empress alone, in the same manner as the Emperor has done and the Court of Lisbon is about to do. It would be more consistent with our national dignity than a public recognition of them (which would seem to proceed from fear); and it would be highly agreeable to the Ministers here. You will not forget, Sir, that this is a private letter, in which I give my private opinion; and that, in the mean time, I shall spare no pains to derive every possible advantage from the measures already proposed, and to incline the Empress to agree to the conditions we held out.

"They are very sufficiently advantageous to her, but arguments founded on plain sense and sound reasoning are not always listened to.

"I have the honor to be,
"Most respectfully and sincerely, dear Sir,
"Your most obedient faithful servant,
"JAMES HARRIS."

[Great Britain had been left destitute of continental allies by the Peace of 1763, and the successive Administrations that followed, occupied with domestic squabbles, or engaged in a frantic contest with our American colonies, had been negligent of foreign politics. Mr. Fox was sensible of this error. One of the first

objects of his Administration was to renew our connections with the continent; and one of his first attempts was to form a defensive confederacy in the North, by uniting Russia and Prussia with England, in opposition to the exorbitant ambition and insolent pretensions of the House of Bourbon. With that view he seems to have written the following letter for the King of Prussia. Through what channel it was to be conveyed does not appear, nor is it certain that it was ever sent, though, from allusions in the following year to what had passed at this period, it probably was. At all events it deserves insertion in this work, as it contains an exposition of Mr. Fox's views on foreign policy in 1782. His advances were received by his Prussian Majesty with civil expressions, and assurances of personal esteem and regard. The King of Prussia was, in truth, too old and too cautious to embark in new and hazardous undertakings. Jealous of the Emperor, afraid of Russia, and inclined in his heart to France, though deterred by her Austrian connection, he desired nothing more than to end his days in peace and tranquillity.]

[PRIVATE LETTER OF MR. FOX, WRITTEN IN ORDER TO BE COMMUNICATED TO THE KING OF PRUSSIA.][1]

"Les assurances que vous m'avez données, Monsieur, de l'amitié que le Roi votre maître porte à la nation anglaise, m'encouragent à vous écrire de mon chef, et sans avoir consulté personne, avec la plus entière confiance, sur l'état actuel des affaires de ce pays ci. Nous sommes accablés du nombre et de la force de nos ennemis, et quelque belle et glorieuse que sera la défense que nous comptons faire contre une conféderation aussi puissante que celle que nous attaque, il est à craindre, que cette gloire ne nous coûte bien cher, et que nous ne nous trouvions epuisés par les efforts que nous ferons quand même les évènemens prissent une tournure plus favorable que nous n'avons raison d'espérer. Il est vrai que les embarras où nous nous trouvons ne sont que le fruit des fautes sans nombre que nous avons faites, et du mauvais système de politique

[1] From the draft in the handwriting of Mr. Fox.

que nous avons dès longtems suivi; mais il est vrai aussi que quelle qu'en soit la cause, il importe infiniment à toutes les nations de l'Europe et sur tout à celles du Nord d'empêcher que nous ne succombions à la maison de Bourbon, qui vise au despotisme de l'Europe avec des vues bien plus solides et mieux fondées que du tems de Louis XIV., quand tout le monde en avoit une jalousie si fondée. Nous nous sommes brouillés avec nos colonies sans raison, et après la rupture nous nous sommes conduits avec ce même esprit d'imprudence et d'erreur qui l'avoit occasionnée. Nous avons vu, sans faire le moindre mouvement pour l'empêcher, et presque sans en avoir conçu de la jalousie, naître et croître la marine des Bourbons que nous avions quasi ecrasée dans la dernière guerre, tandis que nous désarmions la nôtre par les efforts que nous faisions pour ruiner le commerce des colonies, et que nous en abusions les ressources dans les vastes armées de terre que nous employions si mal en Amérique, et qui ont excité à la fois l'admiration et le mépris de l'Europe. Dès que la France s'est declarée, évènement auquel tout le monde, hormis nos prédécesseurs, s'attendoit depuis longtems, au lieu de concilier l'amitié des puissances Européennes, nous avons eu la folie de nous plonger dans la guerre d'Hollande absolument sans raison et quasi sans prétexte. C'est avec honte, sans doute, que je fais un récit si humiliant pour ma nation, mais plus nous avons été faibles, plus il devient le devoir et l'intérêt de ceux qui s'intéressent à nous, de nous aider tant de conseils que d'autres moyens. Les suites des mauvais conseils qu'on n'a cessé de donner au Roi depuis le commencement de son règne, et d'imprimer tant qu'on a pu dans son esprit, ne sont à présent que trop apparentes à tout le monde. Mais malheureusement le mal n'est découvert que dans un tems où il est bien difficile d'y remédier. Qu'y faire? Si nous tentons une paix avec la Hollande nous la trouvons engagée si avant avec la France qu'elle méprise dans ce moment les termes mêmes qu'elle avait offerts comme base de la paix. Avec l'Amérique je crains bien que nous ne trouvions les mêmes difficultés. Il ne reste donc que l'alternative d'une paix générale ou d'une guerre trop inégale. Quant à la première, quelle espérance que la maison de Bourbon, dont l'ambition

démesurée ne paraît que trop aux yeux de tout le monde, veuille la faire sur des termes raisonnables, sans compter l'humiliation qu'il y aurait pour l'Angleterre à la lui demander dans sa position actuelle? Mais quand même la France fût plus modérée qu'il n'y a lieu d'espérer, à quelles demandes ne faut-il pas s'attendre du côté de l'Espagne? N'exigera-t-elle pas la cession de Gibraltar? et Gibraltar une fois cédé, ne faut-il pas dire adieu pour jamais à toute sûreté de commerce dans la Méditerranée pour l'Angleterre et pour les autres nations d'Europe, qui après cette cession dépendront absolument quant à cet objet de la maison de Bourbon? Ce n'est pas tout: en cédant cette place si heureusement située pour diviser et affaiblir les forces navales des Bourbons, ne perdrons nous pas un avantage dans la guerre qu'il est impossible d'apprécier? Il est vrai que dans celle d'à présent nous ne nous en sommes pas servis à cet effet, mais aussi faut-il avouer que tout nous a fort mal tourné. S'il y a toutes ces difficultés pour faire la paix, celles qui s'offrent dans la seconde alternative sont bien plus évidentes, puisqu'il ne faut que compter les forces de nos ennemis et celles que nous pouvons leur opposer pour en sentir toute l'étendue. Il n'y a d'exemple que du Roi votre maître dans les annales de l'Europe qui s'est trouvé dans des embarras pareils aux nôtres, et qui s'en est tiré avec une gloire que n'appartient qu'à lui seul, et dont la renommée universelle fera le trait le plus marqué dans le tableau du siècle où nous vivons. A qui donc s'adresser si ce n'est à lui dont l'amitié nous a tant valu dans des tems plus heureux, qui connaît parfaitement l'embarras où nous nous trouvons, qui a des lumières pour en pénétrer les causes, qui seul peut nous indiquer les moyens d'en sortir, et qui sans doute se rappelle avec complaisance le tems où les deux nations agissaient en concert, époque certainement pas la moins illustre de son règne. C'est donc à lui que j'ose demander conseil et appui dans les circonstances présentes.

"En demandant des conseils à S. M. P., je suis bien loin de vouloir lui en suggérer, mais vous vous attendez peut-être que je débite au moins quelques idées générales sur les objets qui se présentent. D'abord une paix générale et durable, et pour être

durable il faut qu'elle ne soit point incompatible avec la dignité de la couronne de la Grande Brétagne, ni avec la liberté du commerce de l'Europe. Nous sommes parfaitement d'accord que l'indépendance de l'Amérique ne doive pas y mettre d'obstacle. Si cette paix, comme nous le craignons, ne peut s'accomplir pour les raisons ci-devant exposées, le second objet sera de détacher la Hollande, ou l'Amérique, ou toutes les deux, de la maison de Bourbon. En cas que nous ne réussissions pas dans ce second objet, il ne nous reste que de faire cette guerre inégale dans la quelle nous nous trouvions engagés. Mais reste à voir si S. M. P., conjointement avec les puissances du Nord, ne pourrait dans ce cas demander à la France enfin ce qu'elle prétend et où tendent ses vues. La Russie surtout pourrait, en cas que la Hollande manque au respect qu'elle doit à la mediation de l'Impératrice, s'engager à protéger des Hollandais le commerce que nous faisons avec la Baltique. Si le Danemarque s'y joignait tout serait dit de ce côté-là, et la république se trouvant par-là dénuée du principal moyen qu'elle a pour nous nuire serait bientôt réduite à vouloir se réconcilier avec ses anciens amis. Je répète encore que ce ne sont là que des idées vagues que je mets sous les yeux de S. M. P., pour que ses lumières supérieures les apprécient et m'en fassent connaître la valeur.

"Si nos ennemis sont réellement portés pour la paix les conquêtes que nous avons faites dans les grandes Indes, tant sur la France que sur la Hollande, nous donnent de quoi négocier avec eux sur ce qu'il nous ont pris ailleurs.

"Si j'osais hasarder mes faibles idées, il me paraîtrait que la première démarche que S. M. P. pourrait faire en notre faveur ce seroit de pousser la Russie à soutenir l'honneur de sa médiation et d'être un peu plus attentive aux affaires de l'Angleterre qu'elle n'a paru jusqu'ici de l'être. Cette démarche aurait d'abord l'avantage de montrer à l'Europe que nous ne sommes pas délaissés entièrement, et pourrait, ce me semble, mener assez naturellement au point que nous désirons.

"Mais à l'égard des démarches qu'il faudra prendre, et par où l'on doit commencer, je m'en rapporte entièrement à la prudence, à la justesse, et à la profondeur d'esprit de celui à qui j'ai la hardiesse

de m'adresser. Quoique j'aie écrit cette lettre sans concert, ni avec mes collègues, ni avec personne, je puis vous assurer que sur les points principaux, c'est-à-dire, sur la confiance qu'on a au Roi vôtre maître, et sur le désir qu'on a de resserrer entre lui et S. M. les liens d'amitié qui ont été si heureux pour tous les deux, et sur le désir sincère de faire une paix équitable, tous les ministres du Roi entretiennent des sentimens conformes à ceux que j'ai eu l'honneur de vous exposer."

[NEGOTIATIONS AT PARIS.]

[The negotiations for peace at Paris will require to be treated at greater length. They were begun by a private letter from Dr. Franklin to Lord Shelburne,[1] with whom he had been acquainted in England, containing general expressions of his desire to co-operate in the re-establishment of a general peace. On receiving this letter, which had been written to him as a private person, Lord Shelburne, now one of the Secretaries of State, dispatched Mr. Oswald to Paris[2] with a letter to Dr. Franklin, in which he described Mr. Oswald as a "pacifical man, and conversant in those negotiations which are most beneficial to mankind," and "preferred on that account to any speculative friends, or to any persons of a higher rank." As an additional recommendation, Mr. Oswald was furnished with a letter from Mr. Laurens, then a prisoner in England, praising him as an old acquaintance, "a gentleman of the strictest candor and integrity," who "disinterestedly engaged in the business from motives of benevolence." Dr. Franklin liked Mr. Oswald very much, and after presenting him to M. de Vergennes, sent him back to England[3] with a letter to Lord Shelburne, in which, amidst many commendations of his wisdom and honesty, he expresses his "desire to have no other communication" with his lordship "than that of Mr. Oswald." The truth is, Dr. Franklin very quickly discovered that Mr. Oswald was a simple-minded, well-meaning man, on whom he could make the impression he chose, and desired nothing better than to have such a negotiator to deal with. Such confidence had he in Mr.

[1] March 22, 1782. [2] April 6, 1782. [3] April 18, 1782.

Oswald that, at the moment of parting, he trusted him confidentially with a paper to Lord Shelburne, in which, on pretence of bringing about a thorough reconciliation between England and America, and of preventing future quarrels, he suggested the cession of Canada to the United States, as a means of repaying the injuries done to American citizens during the war by the English and their allies, the Indians, and of affording an indemnity to the loyalists for the confiscation of their lands. Mr. Oswald declared himself satisfied with the reasoning of the paper, and promised to do his utmost to impress Lord Shelburne with the same conviction.]

[On the return of Mr. Oswald to London, it was resolved to send him back to Paris, and the following Cabinet minute was agreed to.]

"*April* 23, 1782.

"*Present*—Lord Chancellor, Lord President, Duke of Richmond, Marquis of Rockingham, Duke of Grafton, Lord Ashburton, Lord John Cavendish, Lord Keppel, General Conway, Mr. Fox, Lord Shelburne.

"It is humbly submitted to his Majesty that Mr. Oswald shall return to Paris, with authority to name Paris as the place, and to settle with Dr. Franklin the most convenient time for setting on foot a negotiation for a general peace, and to represent to him that the principal points in contemplation are—The allowance of independence to America upon Great Britain's being restored to the situation she was placed in by the treaty of 1763, and that Mr. Fox shall submit to the consideration of the King a proper person to make a similar communication to Mons. de Vergennes."

[The conduct of foreign affairs in England was at that time divided between the two Secretaries of State; the one having what was called the southern, and the other the northern departments. By this unhappy arrangement the negotiations of the two Secretaries could not fail to clash, when part of the business to be done

belonged to the northern, and part to the southern departments; and nothing could prevent such collision but a perfectly good understanding between the two Secretaries of State, which in the present occasion did not prevail. Mr. Oswald was sent to Dr. Franklin, and Mr. Grenville to M. de Vergennes, and in the simplicity of his heart Mr. Oswald revealed to Mr. Grenville conversations he had had with Franklin, which Lord Shelburne had not communicated to Mr. Fox. Of the commencement of this double negotiation, an account is given by Mr. Fox in a letter to Mr. Fitzpatrick. The sequel will appear in the letters of Mr. Grenville and in Mr. Fox's replies.]

[On the 28th of April, Mr. Fox writes to Mr. Fitzpatrick:] "Shelburne has had an answer from Dr. Franklin, who seems much disposed to peace, if general. Mons. de Vergennes has, it seems, expressed the same sentiments, and wishes to have some opening from hence: in consequence of this, Shelburne's man is to go back this day to Paris, and upon the pretence of the business having begun with the American Ministers he had a great mind, if I would have consented, to have kept even this negotiation in his own hands; but this I would not submit to, and so Grenville is to set out for Paris to-morrow or next day, in order to state our ideas of peace to Mons. de Vergennes. Whether anything will come of this, one cannot tell. I think it will all depend upon this point, whether the French like peace enough to make them influence the Spaniards to be reasonable, for, with respect to France, I still think there cannot be many difficulties."

[Mr. Oswald reached Paris on the 4th of May, and had several conversations with Franklin before Mr. Grenville's arrival on the 8th. In these conversations, he reported to Franklin that he had communicated his private and confidential paper to Lord Shelburne, on whom it seemed to "have made an impression," that he (Oswald) "had reason to believe that matter might be settled to our satisfaction (that of America), but in his own mind he did not wish it to be mentioned at the beginning."[1]

[Mr. Grenville shall tell his own story.]

[1] Franklin's Works, by Sparks, vol. ix. pp. 265–270.

"PARIS, *May* 10.

"DEAR CHARLES:—

"The very tiresome dispatch I have just been sending you, and which I thought it however not proper to abridge, has hardly left me the use of my arm, to write to you, though it is highly important I should do so.

"The language of Monsieur de Vergennes, his manner, and those little expressions which it is easier to feel the force of than to put into a dispatch, seem, as far as one can judge in two pretty long conversations, to promise a most ungovernable extent to the sense of the two terms he repeats so often, justice and dignity;—that he wishes for peace, I do believe, but that the expectation of our being obliged to make peace as a country, and most particularly of your being obliged to make peace to support your new Administration, is what makes great part of his desire for peace, I cannot but believe likewise. Every expression that M. D'Aranda and he used to-day were those of a very close pruning; the first, however, did not this morning hint anything of Gibraltar, but neither did he, as he said, allow himself hardly to speak upon the subject of peace till he had powers. He expects his courier back about this day three weeks, or perhaps rather sooner; in this state of things, you will have a good deal to determine upon within a few days, for you will see the necessity of my being fully apprised of your intentions before I shall be again called upon, as in the conversations I have had I have already gone pretty near the extent of my instructions. It seems, I think, certain that when M. D'Aranda's powers come, Mr. Jay likewise will arrive, and all the persons requisite being then at Paris, whoever comes from you will be called upon to make overtures. Will the same be made with those in my instructions? If they are, you must, I think, see that they will not probably even set the business a-going. If you mean to make others—have you decided upon the extent of them and the form in which they are to be put, whether stated as preliminary articles, or only ideas suggested by which to form hem? You will perhaps be surprised at my first letters contain-

ing so many queries, and expect that the post from Paris should assist you in answering them, but yet you see that, as things now stand, there is scarce a probability of my being able to get anything from M. de Vergennes and D'Aranda till the period I mention, and therefore that your determination must probably be made upon what you now know. Mr. Walpole, who, though a little disappointed, seems disposed to give me every assistance he can, seems, I think, persuaded that they will run too hard upon us; if so, would it be wise to lower one's self by humiliating offers which will not be received, because they are not sufficiently humiliating? Perhaps you will say, let us see what it is they want; let us; but let us do it without coming near enough to their proposition to be disgraced by it. If it is likely to be so disgraceful as that we cannot embrace it, and be benefited by accepting it, would it not, perhaps, be more manly and more dignified to state at once the extent of what reasonable and supportable concessions can be made? (for concessions there must be.) Shall we not by that have the same prospect of succeeding in a treaty, and the most respectable retreat from it if it should fail? I will not tire you with more questions, but let me know what you think of those I have made you. I shall say nothing more about myself than recommending to you, for your own sake as well as mine, to consider my ignorance of this sort of business, should it take any extent; and how advisable, in that case, or rather how indispensable, that you should have here somebody of knowledge, as well as of confidence. Mr. Oswald and I are upon very good terms, but you will naturally see why his assistance is not always that which can be useful to me. I am not now speaking with an affectation of modesty, therefore pray think seriously of it. M. de Vergennes told me to-day, I must not talk of Charlestown, for we had ordered it to be evacuated. I told him very truly I knew nothing of the matter. It is believed, in Paris, that M. de Grasse is gone to St. Domingo, and that there will still be an attack upon Jamaica; the French schemes, I hear, are rather at a stand as to sending troops to North America, and that the present idea is only to keep up the force that they have. Lafayette is not gone. I breakfast with him at Franklin's at nine

to-morrow morning; it's now past three, and I am quite tired with writing, so, I believe, is the messenger with waiting. I was asked to-day, whether there was not a great disunion between the Duke of Richmond and Lord Shelburne? Good-night; if anything worth sending the other messenger for occurs, I will send him; if not, I will write by the post, though only one line, as it is sure of being opened.

"The courier has a letter for Lord Shelburne from Oswald, one for Lord Camden from Walpole, and one for Lord Shelburne, and another for you from Franklin.

"Very affectionately yours,

"T. G."

[On the 14th, Mr. Oswald returned to London, and Franklin, though disappointed at "the little he had been able to draw from him of Lord Shelburne's sentiments," in his letter to that nobleman, expresses regret for his departure, and hopes of his return.[1]

On the 18th of May the following minute was agreed to by the Cabinet:—[2]

"Grosvenor Square, *May* 18, 1782.

"*Present*—Lord Chancellor, Lord President, Duke of Richmond, Lord Rockingham, Lord Shelburne, Lord John Cavendish, Lord Keppel, Lord Ashburton, General Conway, Mr. Fox.

"It is humbly submitted to your Majesty, that your Majesty will be pleased to direct Mr. Fox to order full powers to be given to Mr. Grenville to treat and conclude at Paris, and also to direct Mr. Fox to instruct Mr. Grenville to make propositions of peace to the belligerent powers upon the basis of independence to the thirteen colonies in North America, and of the treaty of Paris; and in case of such proposition not being accepted, to call upon Monsieur de Vergennes to make some proposition on his part, which Mr. Grenville will, of course, report to Mr. Fox."

[1] Franklin's Works, by Sparks, vol. ix. p. 286.

[2] In the handwriting of Mr. Fox.

MR. FOX TO THE KING.

"Mr. Fox has the honor of transmitting to your Majesty the minute of the Cabinet Council assembled this morning at Lord Rockingham's. Mr. Grenville will, no doubt, make a proper use of the very important news of this day, upon which Mr. Fox begs leave to take this opportunity of congratulating your Majesty; but, in general, Mr. Fox thinks it his duty to submit it to your Majesty, that your Majesty's servants have proceeded upon this occasion rather upon the supposition that the present negotiation for peace will fail, and that the measures which they humbly recommend to your Majesty upon this occasion are directed more with a view to the use which may be made of them, for the purposes of detaching from France her present allies, and of conciliating the powers of Europe to this country, than to the object of success in the present treaty with the Court of Versailles. If Monsieur de Vergennes should reject Mr. Grenville's proposals, and should either decline making any on his part, or make such as should be evidently inadmissible, your Majesty's servants cannot help flattering themselves that such a conduct, on the part of the Court of Versailles, may produce the most salutary effects with regard both to Europe and to America, and possibly to the exertions of Great Britain herself.

"Mr. Fox takes this opportunity of informing your Majesty, that the Irish business passed yesterday in the House of Commons unanimously."

MR. GRENVILLE TO MR. FOX.

PARIS, *May* 27, 1782.

"DEAR CHARLES:—

"Lauzun arrived here on the 25th, with your gazette and dispatches, and I have this moment received your *post* letter of the 18th. General Murray goes to England to-morrow, and to him I give this letter, as I shall not dispatch a messenger till I receive a distinct answer from Monsieur de Vergennes. I went

to him yesterday, and, having given him the copy of the full power to read, he told me there was a difficulty *au premier pas*, for that the full power enabled me only to confer with the *French* Ministers; whereas H. M. C. M. had already declared he could only treat in conjunction with his allies, that he had yet had no answer from Spain, and Holland, &c. I say &c., because he told me he could not give me a *formal* answer till the 29th, so that I wait for that before I send a messenger, and only take this opportunity of telling you what the Secretary of State will hear in a more regular form.

"Far from being disappointed at your not extending your propositions, I should have been disappointed if you had; nor do I at all wish you to think, because I expect no success from those propositions, that I shall desire to be the bearer of others more promising because more dishonorable. I must repeat in every letter, that I believe the demands of France and Spain will be dishonorable and ruinous to us; and, in truth, if the ruin is to be equal, there is more manly ruin in resisting than in acquiescing: it is to show you that this opinion has hitherto been uniform, and from a sort of scruple I have of suppressing any letter I had meant to send, that I inclose with this one written to you on the 21st, which I could not then send. I shall lose no opportunity with Franklin that I can lay hold of; one must watch one's time with him, for he is not a man that can be pressed. Adieu. I will write again by the messenger in two days. I inclose to you a letter from Monsieur de Castries, and a French account of the battle in the West Indies, which was once half printed for a gazette, but afterwards countermanded.

"You will see, in my letter of the 21st, an indisposition to the character you have sent me—that character will not assist you, and will embarrass me; for I can do as much of the business you want, without the dignity and salary of the silver box, as with it —therefore will only add that if I give way to you, in taking the full powers, that is to say, the second edition, I shall expect you to gratify my vanity in letting me hold only the useful part of it, and not expecting me to take the emoluments, whatever they may

be; this, too, you will find to be no sacrifice, for I am, and mean to stay, in a *hôtel garni*, without one farthing's additional expense for all my additional dignities. Adieu, my dear Charles, ever very affectionately yours, and very happy in learning that people think more and more of you as they ought.

"T. G."

MR. GRENVILLE TO MR. FOX.

"PARIS, *May* 30, 1782.

"DEAR CHARLES:—

"Having sent you two letters by General Murray, who left Paris the day before yesterday, I have very little to add in this, besides the impatience I feel to send away the courier, who has been delayed these four days for Monsieur de Vergennes's answer. You will see, by the dispatch I send you, that we are not more advanced than we were; the news of our victory has made them something more peevish without more inclining them to peace, which everybody here thinks more distant than ever. I do not cease to try what can be done with Franklin, and though he never gives any hope of a separate treaty which shall detach them from France, he certainly expresses every intention and wish of making a solid union. He promised me to write down some heads upon this subject, which he will talk over with me in two or three days, and seemed quite satisfied with me when I assured him, upon seeing why he hesitated, that if he wished it I would consider what was to pass as mere conversation, and not as a direct negotiation; so that when I give you an account of it you will, I am sure, not forget to carry that idea along with you. He professes always a great opinion of you, and a great confidence that something essential may now be done between the two countries; but you must not be sanguine in expecting that America will be detached from France in this negotiation, as Franklin seems too jealous of the faith of his first treaty to hear of anything that looks like abandoning it; but I will not now say more, as my next letter will probably be confined to that subject.

"Your instructions desire me to be attentive to the Dutch minister, but Mr. Berkenrode is no Solomon, and if he was I should not profit by it, for, finding, when I came here, that it was wished at Versailles that I should not make a very public appearance, I have hardly gone into any company, nor seen people but those who I thought could be useful, and have as yet owned my employment to nobody. I say nothing about myself, in addition to what you have heard from me in my letters by Murray, but as I do not see any great probability of this becoming a very *long* negotiation here, I do not mean to trouble you for the assistance of a secretary; the only use I see likely to result from my journey, is what may be got from learning Franklin's ideas, and to that I now chiefly direct my attention; because, even if they are not practicable at this moment, they may come to be so.

"Adieu. Ever affectionately yours,

"T. G.

"P. S.—I believe Mons. de Castries has as yet no other account of the engagement but that which I sent you by Murray; the frigate in which some of the officers sailed from Brest met with a storm, and put back to Nantes. Jay will be here in a day or two from Madrid.

"Pray thank Sheridan for his letter; I will write to him by the first opportunity. You will recollect that, till I hear from you about the full power, I can have no conversation with Mons. de Vergennes. As I am sealing my letter, I learn that an officer is just come with the detail of the action to Mons. de Castries."

[In the mean while, the following important resolution had been adopted by the Cabinet, and communicated to Mr. Grenville.]

"Clarges Street, *May* 23, 1782.

"*Present*—Lord Chancellor, Lord Privy Seal, Lord Rockingham, Lord Shelburne, Lord John Cavendish, Lord Keppel, Lord Ashburton, General Conway, Mr. Fox.

"It is humbly recommended to your Majesty to direct Mr. Fox to instruct Mr. Grenville to propose the independency of America in the first instance, instead of making it a condition of a general treaty."

[On the 30th, Mr. Oswald returned to Paris, with a memorandum from Lord Shelburne, to be shown to Dr. Franklin, engaging, among other things, that "any character should be given to Mr. Oswald which Dr. Franklin thought conducive to a final settlement of things between Great Britain and America." To this suggestion Dr. Franklin readily acceded. Mr. Oswald, he says, "appears so good and so reasonable a man, that, though I have no objection to Mr. Grenville, I should be loath to lose Mr. Oswald. He seems to have nothing at heart but the good of mankind, and putting a stop to mischief; the other, a young statesman, may be supposed to have naturally a little ambition of recommending himself as an able negotiator."[1] In the following letters of Mr. Grenville and Mr. Fox, will be seen the consequences of this message, and of the discovery of the previous communications between Franklin and Lord Shelburne.]

"Paris, *June* 4, 1782.

"Sir:—

"Mr. Oswald arrived here on the 30th, the day after Ogg was gone, and I received by him the honor of your letter of the 26th.

"You will have seen, by my last of the 30th, that Mons. de Vergennes' objections to the full power are such as, while they subsist, preclude any further discussion of business. I have, therefore, with regard to him, nothing new to inform you of. It cannot, however, Sir, have escaped your notice, that the offer of independence in the first instance, instead of making it a conditional article of general treaty, necessarily changes a part of the propositions I had in charge to make to Mons. de Vergennes. I take it for granted, therefore, that in any future con-

[1] Franklin's Works, by Sparks, vol. ix. pp. 314–317.

versation with the French Minister, it was your intention that I should omit the mention of independence, and confine myself simply to the peace of 1763 as the basis of a treaty. But, as I should be very sorry to misinterpret this or any part of your instructions, I flatter myself that you will have the goodness to direct me upon this subject—the doubt which has arisen from Mons. de Vergennes and Mr. Franklin, about the full power, gives sufficient time for this explanation without any additional delay.

"It is, I see, in the sense I mention, that Mr. Franklin wishes it, for when I spoke to him of the offer your last letter would authorize, he expressed very great satisfaction at its being kept out of the treaty with France, adding that the more good England did to America, the more America would assist this business; to repeat, therefore, the same offer as a proposition to France, would defeat its purpose with America.

"I hope soon to receive your orders upon this, as upon the subject of my last letter, in which I ought to have added that Mr. Franklin seemed not a little jealous of there being no powers yet sent to treat with America.

"I am, &c.

"THOMAS GRENVILLE."

MR. GRENVILLE TO MR. FOX.

"PARIS, *June* 4, 1782.

"DEAR CHARLES:—

"The *public* letter which I send to you by Lauzun is, as you will see, of no other use than that of accounting for his journey, and enabling him to carry to you this *private* one, of which I had once almost determined to be myself the bearer. An apprehension, however, that so sudden an arrival might be embarrassing to you has decided me not to take that step till I had explained to you my reasons for wishing to do so, though I should not care to write them except in the full confidence that they will be seen by no persons whatever but yourself. Recollect always that this letter is written in that confidence, and I am sure I never can re-

pent of having sent it. You will easily see, from the tenor of the correspondence we have hitherto had, that what little use I could be of to you here, appeared to me to be in the communication that I had with Franklin. I considered the rest of the negotiation as dependent upon that, and the only possible immediate advantages which were to be expected seemed to me to rest in the jealousy which the French Court would entertain of not being thoroughly supported in everything by America. The degree of confidence which Franklin seemed inclined to place in me, and which he expressed to me, more than once, in the strongest terms, very much favored this idea, and encouraged me in wishing to learn from him what might be, in future, ground for a partial connection between England and America; I say in future, because I have never hitherto much believed in any treaty of the year 1782, and my expectation, even from the strongest of Franklin's expressions, was not of an immediate turn in our favor, or any positive advantage from the Commissioners in Europe, till the people of America should cry out to them, from seeing that England was meeting their wishes. It was in this light, too, that I saw room to hope for some good effects from a voluntary offer of unconditional independence to America; a chance which looked the more tempting, as I own I considered the sacrifice as but a small one, and such as, had I been an American, I had thought myself little obliged to Great Britain in this moment for granting, except from an idea that, if it was an article of treaty, it would have been as much given by France as by England.

"I repeat this only to remind you that, from these considerations, the whole of my attention has been given to Franklin, and that I should have considered myself as losing my time here, if it had not been directed to that subject. I believe I told you in my last that I had very sanguine expectations of Franklin's being inclined to speak out, when I should see him next; indeed, he expressly told me that he would think over all the points likely to establish a solid reconciliation between England and America, and that he would write his mind upon them, in order that we might examine them together more in order, confiding, as he said,

in me, that I would not state them as propositions from him, but as being my own ideas of what would be useful to both countries. (I interrupt myself here, to remind you of the obligation I must put you under not to mention this). For this very interesting communication, which I had long labored to get, he fixed the fourth day, which was last Saturday; but on Friday morning Mr. Oswald came, and having given me your letters, he went immediately to Franklin, to carry some to him. I kept my appointment at Passy the next morning, and in order to give Franklin the greatest confidence, at the same time, too, not knowing how much Mr. Oswald might have told him, I began with saying, that though under the difficulty which M. de Vergennes and he himself had made to my full power, it was not the moment, as a politician perhaps, to make further explanations till that difficulty should be relieved, yet to show him the confidence I put in him, I would begin by telling him that I was authorized to offer the independence in the first instance, instead of making it an article of general treaty. He expressed great satisfaction at this, especially he said, because, by having done otherwise, we should have seemed to have considered America as in the same degree of connection with France which she had been under with us, whereas America wished to be considered as a power free and clear to all the world; but when I came to lead the discourse to the subject which he had promised four days before, I was a good deal mortified to find him put it off altogether till he should be more ready, and notwithstanding my reminding him of his promise, he only answered that it should be in some days. What passed between Mr. Oswald and me will explain to you the reason of this disappointment. Mr. Oswald told me that Lord Shelburne had proposed to him, when last in England, to take a commission to treat with the American Ministers; that upon his mentioning it to Franklin now, it seemed perfectly agreeable to him, and even to be what he had very much wished, Mr. Oswald adding that he wished only to assist the business, and had no other view; he mixed with this a few regrets that there should be any difference between the two offices, and when I asked upon what subject, he

said owing to the Rockingham party being too ready to give up everything. You will observe though—for it is on that account that I give you this narrative—that this intended appointment has effectually stopped Franklin's mouth to me, and that when he is told that Mr. Oswald is to be the Commissioner to treat with him, it is but natural that he should reserve his confidence for the quarter so pointed out to him; nor does this secret seem only known to Franklin, as Lafayette said laughingly yesterday, that he had *just left Lord Shelburne's ambassador at Passy.* Indeed, this is not the first moment of a separate negotiation, for Mr. Oswald, suspecting by something that I dropped that Franklin had talked to me about Canada (though, by the by, he never had), told me this circumstance, as follows: When he went to England the last time but one, he carried with him a paper intrusted to him by Franklin under condition that it should be shown only to Lord Shelburne and returned into his own hands at Passy. This paper, under the title of 'Notes of a Conversation,' contained an idea of Canada being spontaneously ceded by England to the thirteen provinces, in order that Congress might sell the unappropriated lands and make a fund thereby, in order to compensate the damages done by the English army, and even those too sustained by the Royalists; this paper, given with many precautions for fear of its being known to the French Court, to whom it was supposed not to be agreeable, Mr. Oswald showed to Lord Shelburne, who, after keeping it a day as Mr. Oswald supposes, to show to the King, returned it to him, and it was by him brought back to Franklin. I say nothing to the proposition itself, to the impolicy of bringing a *strange* neighborhood to the Newfoundland fishery, or to the little reason that England would naturally see, in having lost thirteen provinces, to give away a fourteenth; but I mention it to show you an early trace of separate negotiation which perhaps you did not before know.

"Under these circumstances, I felt very much tempted to go over, and explain them to you *vivâ voce* rather than by letter, and I must say, with the farther intention of suggesting to you the only idea that seems likely to answer your purpose, and it is this:

the Spanish Ambassador will, in a day or two, have the powers from his Court; the Americans are here, so are the French; why should you not, then, consider this as a Congress in full form, and send here a person of rank, such as Lord Fitzwilliam (if he would come), so as to have the whole negotiation in the hands of one person? You would by that means recover within your compass the essential part, which is now out of it; nor do I see how Lord Shelburne could object to such an appointment, which would, in every respect, much facilitate the business. Let me press this a little strongly to you, for another reason. You may depend upon it, people here have already got an idea of a difference between the two offices; and consider how much that idea will be assisted by the embarrassments arising from two people negotiating to the same purpose, but under different and differing authorities, concealing and disguising from each other what, with the best intentions, they could hardly make known, and common enough to each. I am almost afraid of pressing this as strongly as I should, for fear you should think me writing peevishly, but if I did not state the thing to you in the situation in which I see it, I should think I was betraying your interests, instead of giving attention to them. I must entreat you very earnestly to consider this, to see the impossibility of my assisting you under this contrariety; to see how much the business itself will suffer, if carried on with the jealousy of these clashing interests; and to see whether it may not all be prevented by some single appointment in high rank, as that I mentioned. *Au reste*, I cannot but say that I feel much easier, with the hope of making over what remains of this business; I begin to feel it weighty, and you know how much I dislike the *publicity* you packed off to me in that confounded silver box. I could not bring myself to say anything civil about it in my last letter, and you ought to give me credit for great self-denial in not taking this opportunity of telling you my own story at the Secretary's office, as nothing but the embarrassment it might give you upon the sudden, prevented me. Once more I tell you, I cannot fight a daily battle with Mr. Oswald and *his* secretary; it would be nei-

ther for the advantage of the business, for your interest or your credit, or mine, and even if it was, I could not do it.

"Concluding, then, the American business as out of the question, which personally I cannot be sorry for, you surely have but one of two things to do; either to adopt the proposition of a new *dignified* Peer's appointment, which, being single, may bring back the business to you by comprehending it all in one; or Lord Shelburne must have his minister here, and Mr. Fox his, by doing which Mr. Fox will be pretty near as much out of the secret—at least of what is most essential—as if he had nobody here, and the only real gainers by it will be the other Ministers, who cannot fail to profit of such a jumble; besides which, upon this latter part of the subject, I must very seriously entreat you with regard to myself, not to ask me to keep a situation here, in no circumstances pleasant, and in none less so than those I have described. The grievance is a very essential one; the remedy is Lord Fitzwilliam. Adieu. I recommend to Lauzun to make all the haste he can, as I shall not stir a step till you answer this letter, and my step then will, I hope, be towards you.

"Sheridan's letter of suspicion was written, as you see, in the spirit of prophecy. I owe him an answer, which by word of mouth, or word of letter, he shall have very soon.

"The news of the day is that the Cadiz fleet, twenty-six sail of the line and five French, are sailed for Brest; but I rather imagine they have no authentic account of it yet.

"Adieu. Let Lord Fitzwilliam answer my letter."

MR. FOX TO MR. GRENVILLE.

"St. James's, *June* 10, 1782.

"Dear Grenville:—

"I received late the night before last your interesting letter of the 4th, and you may easily conceive am not a little embarrassed by its contents. In the first place, it was not possible to comply with your injunction of perfect secrecy in a case where steps of such importance are necessary to be taken, and therefore I have taken upon me (for which I must trust to your friendship to ex-

cuse me) to show your letter to Lord Rockingham, the Duke of Richmond, and Lord John, who are all as full of indignation at its contents as one might reasonably expect honest men to be. We are now perfectly resolved to come to an explanation upon the business, if it is possible so to do without betraying any confidence reposed in me by you, or in you by others. The two principal points which occur are the paper relative to Canada, of which I had never heard till I received your letter, and the intended investment of Mr. Oswald with full powers, which was certainly meant for the purpose of diverting Franklin's confidence from you into another channel. With these two points we wish to charge Shelburne directly; but pressing as the thing is, and interesting as it is both to our situations and to the affairs of the public, which I fear are irretrievably injured by this intrigue, and which must be ruined if it is suffered to go on, we are resolved not to stir a step till we hear again from you, and know precisely how far we are at liberty to make use of what you have discovered. If this matter should produce a rupture, and consequently become more or less the subject of public discussion, I am sensible the Canada paper cannot be mentioned by name; but might it not be said that we had discovered that Shelburne had withheld from our knowledge matters of importance to the negotiation? And, with respect to the other point, might it not be said, without betraying anybody, that while the King had one avowed and authorized Minister at Paris, measures were taken for lessening his credit, and for obstructing his inquiries, by announcing a new intended commission, of which the Cabinet here had never been apprised? Do, pray, my dear Grenville, consider the incredible importance of this business in every view, and write me word precisely how far you can authorize us to make use of your intelligence. It is more than possible that, before this reaches you, many other circumstances may have occurred which may afford further proofs of this duplicity of conduct, and if they have, I am sure they will not have escaped your observation. If this should be the case, you will see the necessity of acquainting me with them as soon as possible. You see what is our object, and you can easily judge

what sort of evidence will be most useful to us. When the object is attained, that is, when the duplicity is proved, to what consequences we ought to drive, whether to an absolute rupture, or merely to the recall of Oswald and the simplification of this negotiation, is a point that may be afterwards considered. I own I incline to the more decisive measure, and so, I think, do those with whom I must act in concert. I am very happy, indeed, that you did not come yourself; the mischiefs that would have happened from it to our affairs are incredible, and I must beg of you, nay, entreat and conjure you not to think of taking any precipitate step of this nature. As to the idea of replacing you with Lord Fitzwilliam, not only it would be very objectionable on account of the mistaken notion it would convey of things being much riper than they are, but it would, as I conceive, be no remedy to the evil. Whether the King's Minister at Paris be an Ambassador Extraordinary or a Minister Plenipotentiary, can make no difference as to the question. The clandestine manner of carrying on a separate negotiation, which we complain of, would be equally practicable and equally blamable if Lord Fitzwilliam was Ambassador, as it is now that Mr. Grenville is Plenipotentiary. I must therefore again entreat you, as a matter of personal kindness to me, to remain a little longer at Paris; if you were to leave it, all sorts of suspicion would be raised. It is of infinite consequence that we should have it to say, that we have done all in our power to make peace, not only with regard to what may be expected from America, but from Europe. The King of Prussia is certainly inclined to be our friend, but he urges and presses to make peace if possible; if we could once bring the treaty to such a point as the stating the demands on each side to him, and we could have his approbation for breaking it off, I think it not impossible but the best consequences might follow; and with regard to North America, it is surely clear to demonstration that it is of infinite consequence that it should be publicly understood who is to blame if the war continues. I do hope, therefore, that you will at all events stay long enough to make your propositions, and to call upon them to make others in return. I know your situa-

tion cannot be pleasant; but as you first undertook it in a great measure from friendship to me, so let me hope that the same motive will induce you to continue in it, at least for some time. What will be the end of this, God knows; but I am sure you will agree with me that we cannot suffer a system to go on, which is not only dishonorable to us, but evidently ruinous to the affairs of the country. In this instance, the mischief done by intercepting, as it were, the very useful information we expected through you from Franklin, is, I fear, in a great degree irremediable; but it is our business, and indeed our duty, to prevent such things for the future. Everything in Ireland goes on well, and I really think there is good reason to entertain hopes from Russia and Prussia, if your negotiation either goes on, or goes off, as it ought to do."

MR. GRENVILLE TO MR. FOX.

"PARIS, *June* 8, 1782.

"DEAR CHARLES:—

"I wrote to you so much at large by Lauzun, and felt so much persuaded at the time of all I wrote, that I hardly think you can fail of seeing the subject of my letter such as I represented it. There is some vanity you will say in that opinion; but I have it not the less for that, and depend so much upon your agreeing with me, that I should be not a little mortified to find myself mistaken.

"If I profit now of the opportunity of Mr. Damer's going to England, it is only to add that I said little of my own wishes to return in my last letter, because I thought other reasons much more important, would appear to you fully sufficient; those personal reasons, however, which I own have their weight with me, would, I am sure, on that account, have some with you, although you will observe that in my public letter I have not signified any such wish as that contained in my private one; if, in point of form, you think I should do so, you will certainly let me know it, as I have omitted it till I hear from you, only to avoid giving you any unnecessary embarrassment.

"I have not seen Mons. de Vergennes since I wrote last, but

I find that he is inclined to speak of this last affair as a proof of the insincerity of our Court in sending a power they knew could not be admitted, or at least as a proof of their wish to protract. This last idea, by the by, a singular one to come from Versailles, for mark the course of the delay : I go to him almost the moment the courier comes, and I express every wish to expedite the business ; he keeps me four days without an answer, and when he gives it me, makes me send it by Ostend, though I particularly beg the passport by Calais in order to save time. The French Gazette gives no account of the West India engagement, but merely a list of officers killed and wounded in M. de Vaudreuil's division, now arrived at Cape Tiburon ; it ends with his Christian Majesty's orders for immediately building twelve ships from 110 to 64 guns—'let there be ships, and there were ships,' would make the order more formidable, but as it is, they must, I fancy, go through the dock-yards, and be built as well as created before they will do any mischief. The Grand Duke is still here, and there is no end of the *fêtes* they give him ; how lucky it is that he has no thoughts of going to England ; his reception there would not have helped him to a brilliant comparison in our favor ; we should have treated him, as we say, like a friend, that is to say, left him to shift for himself ; he stays here till the 17th.

"Your letter of the 31st, by the post, is just come to me; and I am glad to find you do not disapprove of the letters to Mons. de Vergennes. I have seen Oswald to-day, who again dwelt very much upon its being Franklin's wish that he, Oswald, should have a commission to treat with the Americans. I haunt you upon this subject, in order to confirm you in my ideas about it, and hasten my own return, which I earnestly hope you will not delay. Major Ross is come; Franklin has undertaken to give him Lord Cornwallis's discharge, and he will return the day after to-morrow. Desire Sheridan to show you my letter to him.

"Adieu. Ever very affectionately yours,

"T. GRENVILLE."

MR. GRENVILLE TO MR. SHERIDAN.

"*June* 8, 1782.

"DEAR SHERIDAN:—

"After all the doubts I had expressed of ever hearing from you, it was not very natural that you should find in me the same idleness which I reproached you with by anticipation; nor can I myself account for it except that my surprise was so great as to require some time to persuade myself that I had actually and *bonâ fide* received two letters from you. I am, however, at length convinced of it, for certainly your hand is not easily counterfeited.

"My last letter to Charles very much justifies the doubts which both he and you entertained; the subject of it was such as carried a reason in every line, for my pressing him very earnestly in the first place to consider how little useful I can be to him after the check put to Franklin's confidence, how ruinous it would be to all business here that they should be able to trace at Paris the interior politics of our Ministers, and how many speculations arise upon that subject, here even from this first instance, which must, in the nature of things, be every day confirmed by that appearance of mutual distrust which I foresee no attention will altogether conceal. You will certainly see that none of that serious modesty with which you are so much amused makes any part of this consideration with me, or is the least ground with me for insisting upon the disadvantage which it will be of to Charles, that I should remain here. The evil is, that things are at this moment so circumstanced as to justify the American Secretary in sending a person commissioned to treat distinctly about the preliminaries of peace with the American agents, and that distinct commission excludes altogether the interference or intimate communication of the other office; but this can no longer be the case if Charles will adopt the idea I have suggested to him of letting me come home, which I very much wish to do, and sending here, as to a general Congress, some person of high rank, such as the American Secre-

tary could not object to, with full and complete authority to take possession of the whole business, and so bring back to one point all the parts of this negotiation, which I am sure, in any other shape, will be of no use, but great disservice. The person, I think, might very well answer this purpose, is Lord Fitzwilliam. He is certainly equal to it, in every point of view, and his situation is such, as that it would be indecent in Lord Shelburne either to object to him or to add to him; if, however, there should be any difficulty about Lord Fitzwilliam, of which I am not aware, still, I must repeat that some such person of confidence, and of such high rank as to send him here an unequivocal, undivided Ambassador, is the person that Charles must find, and without whom he will lose ground in the management of this business, and the business itself will take such a form as to expose our own weakness, and give our enemies an advantage in this negotiation which they cannot fail to profit by. The more this is considered, the more strongly I am persuaded it will be seen in the light in which it presents itself to me; and these arguments are in themselves so striking and important, that I persuade myself Charles cannot but see the force of them, and trusting to that, I have rested much less than I otherwise should upon my own personal wish to return. The share of this business to which I was most inclined, was to assist, without any public character, the previous arrangements of it; to do more than that places me here in a situation not agreeable to me, and for a longer time than I had any idea of giving to it. The silver box which you say you looked at with envy, I no sooner saw than I heartily wished back again at his Majesty's silversmith's, and in the answer I wrote to Charles, I made an early protest against any Ministerial establishment; nor has a ten days' possession made me more enamored of the King's sign-manual, or the parchment that hangs to it. If, therefore (which I really cannot persuade myself of), you should find Charles wavering about the public reasons I have given him, be so good as to add these private ones; the sum total amounts to a full persuasion that I can do him no service here, and a very earnest desire to return in the same obscure capacity in which I went, and that

as speedily as may be. Adieu. I am come to the end of my paper before I was aware of it.

"Ever very truly and sincerely yours,

"T. G."

MR. GRENVILLE TO MR. FOX.

[PRIVATE.]

PARIS, *June* 16, 1782.

"DEAR CHARLES:—

"I received your letter of the 10th, by Ogg, on the night of the 14th, and would have sent him back as immediately as you seemed to wish, but having no other messenger to carry back Mons. de Vergennes's answer, I was obliged to keep him till he could be the bearer of that likewise. I can easily conceive the embarrassment occasioned to you by my letter, and have so much confidence in the honor of the persons to whom you communicated it, that I am not under the smallest uneasiness on that account. The explanation, however, that you wish to come to, certainly has its difficulties, and amongst them some so sacred that, unless they can be kept altogether clear, you cannot but agree with me in thinking that they must be buried at least in silence, though not in oblivion. In order, therefore, that you may see into every part of this business, I will, as you desire, state in the most explicit manner the circumstances of it, as far as I think they affect any confidence reposed in me. In the first place, then, you will have observed that although Franklin has actually made me no confidence (owing as I believe without doubt to the reasons I stated), yet as the communication he had said he would make to me was of the most confidential nature, and in full trust that the subjects which he should mention should not be given as propositions coming from him, I think it would be a breach of that confidence to make it known, even that he had promised to hold such a conversation with me; and therefore to charge Lord Shelburne with having diverted from me that expected communication, would be to proclaim Franklin's promise to me, which promise, though it has not been followed up, I cannot think myself at liberty to quote. The delicacy of Franklin's

situation with respect to the French court, was, as he said, the ground of the caution which he observed; and which nevertheless he was inclined to risk in my trust; he would certainly have both to repent and to complain, if anything on my part should lead to betray even the confidential disposition he had entertained. These reasons you will I am sure agree with me in considering as decisive against any mention being to be made of the expectations I had formed from the conversations I was to have had with Franklin. The Canada paper is not perhaps quite under the same circumstances; the only knowledge I have of it is from Oswald, and, as I before told you, I had it from him at a moment when I fancy he apprehended that I had heard or should hear of it from Franklin, no other reason can account for his not mentioning it from the end of April till the 31st of May; he told it me under no express limitation of confidence: the words in which he introduced it were, '*I think it right you should know*;' and I am perfectly sure that he asked from me no engagement of secrecy, nor do I conceive myself under any with regard to him, other than that general secrecy which is always attached to business of a confidential nature, such as was the business I related to you. I recollect asking if he had showed the paper to you; he said no, but did not add any injunction to me not to do so, and indeed if he had, I should have stated to him the impossibility of my keeping from you a circumstance of that importance, or of my becoming by my silence in it a separate party to a business which it was my duty fully and entirely to lay before you and receive from you. Nor, indeed, at this moment is the knowledge of it confined to Lord Shelburne, as I am pretty sure Oswald told me that Lord Ashburton was with Lord Shelburne when he, Oswald, asked if he might give any answer to Franklin about the paper, or rather observed that he supposed he could not then have any answer to it. Under these circumstances, the difficulty with regard to the Canada paper, of which I have no copy, lies possibly more in the indelicacy, and perhaps bad policy, of bringing forward Franklin where he wished so much not to appear than in quoting it from me. I do not wish to be quoted if there exist the least doubt whether I should; but

I cannot more exactly explain to you the whole extent of that doubt, than by showing you that it does not exist in any specific obligation on my part, but only in the nature of what was told to me; the subject itself carrying with it, as you will see, many reasons for secrecy, and every mark of it in the manner of conducting it; but as to positive engagement or obligation upon this subject I have none. The remaining circumstance of the intention mentioned to Mr. Oswald by Lord Shelburne of giving him a commission if it should be necessary, stands altogether clear of the slightest shade of difficulty upon the point of confidence: indeed, at the time I wrote you word of it I did not imagine I was informing you of anything new or unknown to you, and only so far meant to dwell upon it as to regret its happening precisely at the instant when it was most important it should not. I apprehended that Lord Shelburne might have already expressed such an intention to the rest of the King's Ministers, upon the ground of the American share of this business; which ground, in the present stage of it, I thought possibly you had not found it easy to object to. In this idea you will find that I have written, and in this idea it was that Lord Fitzwilliam's appointment occurred to me, not to prevent a *clandestine* negotiation, but to unite a *separated* one, always imagining that you knew of, but did not resist, the intended commission to Mr. Oswald, and therefore hinting the expediency of superseding it, by giving to another person an appointment of such rank and magnitude as should include a power which, it seems, neither for the public interest, nor yours, and your friends' interests, to leave separate and distinct. To return, however, to the point of confidence: upon this last subject, there is none, and you are certainly at full liberty to proclaim at Charing Cross, that Lord Shelburne told Mr. Oswald he supposed he would not object to a commission, if it should be necessary, and that, since his last return to Paris, Mr. Oswald has told me he found it very much Franklin's wish likewise. If I may repeat, therefore, in a few words, what I have tried to express to you in a good many, it is, that as to Franklin's first intention of a private and confidential communication with me, I hold my-

self so engaged in secrecy to him, that I think it would be a breach of confidence in me to have that intention at all spoken of. As to the Canada paper, I leave it, with the comment I have made upon it, altogether to your discretion; and as to the intended commission, you are certainly at full liberty to say of it what you please. I have it not in my power to give you any additional proofs of sinister management in this business. I seldom see Oswald, though upon good terms with him, and have seen Franklin, since Oswald's coming, but once, when he was as silent as ever, notwithstanding my reminding him of his promise, so that I cannot but think that business altogether irretrievable; but neither do I know what you will gain by forcing Oswald's return; indeed, I am inclined to think it might be much more prudent to save appearances by leaving him here till you shall have completed your purpose of receiving the propositions you wish, or the refusal you wish, from Versailles. Perhaps, politically speaking, you may not think it wise to make the conduct, or rather misconduct, of a foreign negotiation, the ground of a domestic rupture, which may betray too much weakness and disunion; but this is too delicate a subject for me to say anything upon, more than to assure you that, whatever is your determination about it, you will not find me shrink from the part I have to take in it. And one word here about the desire I have expressed to return to England. It is impossible not to say that I feel that desire in the strongest degree. I would not speak peevishly about my disappointment in the unlucky check I have met with, but I think you will agree, that the real service it might, perhaps, have been my good fortune to have been assisting in, is by that check completely annihilated, nor can any step now taken recover or retrieve it; and that consideration weighs pretty heavily in a situation in itself not agreeable to me: but if I repeat this now, it is to keep you awake to the earnest solicitations I make of returning in the first moment you may think it practicable; till then, you need have no apprehension of seeing me, but may trust that no personal motives, however strong, can weigh with me against the important reasons, as well as the desire you express, for my continuing something

longer at Paris. I am writing to you on the 16th, waiting impatiently for M. de Vergennes's answer, which he gave me reason to hope I shall have to-morrow."

"June 21. I have been waiting day after day, and have not got my answer till a few hours ago. I am sorry I have kept you so long, but you see it was impossible to avoid it. A report prevails that Bougainville is arrived at St. Domingo with two ships, as are likewise the four that were at Curaçao. They add that Rodney had been obliged to burn three of his captured ships. La Motte Piquet has twice had orders to sail from Brest with his seven ships, and has as often been countermanded. They expect Guichen every day with the Cadiz fleet of thirty-two ships, that sailed the 4th. Tell Sheridan to be more cautious in what he writes by the post. If I had time I would give him a lecture, but I want to send away the messenger. Oswald affects to consider me as fully authorized now, but I believe expects different news as soon as the Independence Bill has passed. Yet I cannot help thinking you had better leave him where he is; his going away will mend nothing. Adieu.

"Ever very affectionately yours,

"THOMAS GRENVILLE."

MR. GRENVILLE TO MR. FOX.

"PARIS, *July* 9, 1782.

"DEAR CHARLES:—

"You apologize for writing me only a few lines. I shall write you still fewer, and make no apology; for after what has passed, I count every minute that the messenger is getting ready to return as so much time lost, however it is employed.

"You are sorry you have drawn me into a scrape. I know of none—at least none that an honest man could keep out of, or need be either sorry or ashamed to have got into. Neither do I see what you have to regret in any part of this business, farther than the late hour in which it was done; you know my system upon that subject, and how firmly it was my opinion that you should not have lost one moment to fight the battle with advantage,

which with or without everybody saw must be to be fought. But as long as it is fought honorably, it is sure to be successful in the end, for one day or another right will always come right.

"I suppose I need not tell you that I have answered Lord Shelburne's letter by the official information he desires, adding to it, '*my fixed purpose firmly to decline any further prosecution in this business, and requesting him, as speedily as may be, to lay before his Majesty, in all duty and humility, my earnest and unalterable prayer that he will be graciously pleased to recall me from the commission I am honored with at Paris.*'

"I write, too, to beg my brother to press my immediate return. I see by his letter he knows nothing of what has passed; if you would show him my letters to you, at my request, under the strictest confidence, he will be apprised of the true state much sooner than if he waits till I come, when I shall certainly tell him. This, however, is at your own choice, if you had rather wait till I come. Adieu. Pray thank Sheridan for his letter; I will write the first moment my messenger is gone. What a time to be out of England, *et Montauciel n'y etoit pas.* I don't think I can quite forgive you. No news here; they say they have taken eighteen transports from us, but they are not yet come into Brest.

"Yours most affectionately,

"THOMAS GRENVILLE."

[In forming our judgment of these transactions, which excited such warmth of indignation in Mr. Fox and Mr. Grenville, we must recollect that the American colonies, as they were still considered in English diplomacy, were in Lord Shelburne's department, as Secretary of State; and that though he had been prevented from assuming on that pretence the direction of the general negotiations for peace, his friend Mr. Oswald had been once sent back to Paris, by order of the Cabinet, with propositions to Dr. Franklin, and so far as it appears had never been recalled, and might therefore still be considered as in communication with the American Minister, and entitled to hold conversations with him on public business. But, on the other hand, it is impossible to

justify Lord Shelburne for his favorable reception of so important a paper as the one he had received from Franklin about Canada, without communicating the substance of it at least to his colleagues; nor can he be acquitted of presumption in proposing, without their knowledge, a separate mission to negotiate with the American Commissioners, nor of want of judgment in leaving to Franklin the decision of a point of so much delicacy, which might affect materially the future progress of the negotiation. That this suggestion put a stop to the proposed confidential communication of Franklin to Mr. Grenville is not improbable, though Franklin accounts for his reserve on this occasion by his finding Mr. Grenville's powers to treat defective; but if we may judge of the value of such communications by the confidential conversations he had with Oswald, it may be doubted whether much was lost by the want of them. He would have drawn from Mr. Grenville what he could for the advantage of his own country, and given him nothing in exchange but honeyed words and vague assurances of returning affection. He was in truth very hostile to England, and had never forgiven the treatment he received from Wedderburn. The anecdote denied by Mr. Sparks, that before the signature of the preliminaries of peace he dressed himself in the coat he had worn at the Privy Council on that occasion, rests, nevertheless, on authority not slightly to be rejected. It was related to Lord Holland by Lord St. Helens, one of the plenipotentiaries employed in negotiating the treaty, and the lasting impression it made on Lord St. Helens leaves little doubt of the accuracy of his recollection. He could not speak without indignation of the triumphant air with which Franklin told them he had laid by and preserved his coat for such an occasion.]

[Before dismissing the subject, it may be proper to insert some unfinished remarks Lord Holland has left on these occurrences, and on the consequent dissensions they produced between two persons so nearly related to him as Mr. Fox and Lord Shelburne.] Of these interviews and conversations (with Mr. Oswald and Mr. Grenville), as well as of his correspondence with Lord Shelburne, Mr. Fox, and others, Dr. Franklin has left a long and minute

account in his private correspondence. He soon perceived that Mr. Oswald and Mr. Grenville were organs of two distincts wills in the Cabinet of St. James's. "Mr. Oswald," he says, "appears to have been the choice of Lord Shelburne, Mr. Grenville that of Mr. Secretary Fox. Lord Shelburne is said to have acquired lately much of the King's confidence. Lord Shelburne seems to wish to have the management of the treaty; Mr. Fox seems to think it is in his department."[1] Franklin at that time preferred Oswald to Grenville, and there are traces of memoranda and other communications from Lord Shelburne to Franklin, of which Fox and Grenville had no cognizance at the time. Franklin thought, at this period of the negotiation (end of May and beginning of June), that Lord Shelburne and his immediate agent were more inclined to concessions to America, and especially of Canada, than Mr. Fox, whom Oswald described as startled at it, but to whom it does not seem to have been thus early communicated. Towards the end of the Rockingham Administration, and on the close of it, Franklin seems to have had misgivings of the designs of Lord Shelburne respecting the independence of America, and to have credited the report of Lord Shelburne's overruling in the Cabinet Mr. Fox's decided plan of "unequivocally acknowledging American independence," and that the intention of that party in the Cabinet was "to retain the sovereignty for the King."[2] This suspicion, which reached Franklin, was much credited at the time by well-informed persons. Some passages in Mr. Fox's speeches seem to indicate a defeat in the Cabinet on the subject of American independence; and General Fitzpatrick, in his Journal, distinctly affirms that Mr. Fox had resolved before Lord Rockingham's death to resign, because he had been "outvoted in Cabinet, on the question of acceding unconditionally to American independence." On the other hand, it is clear that the Cabinet minute of the 18th of May, preserved in Mr. Fox's papers, where ten of the Cabinet, including Lord Shelburne and his friends,

[1] Franklin's Works, by Sparks, ix. 335, 336.
[2] Ibid. ix. 347, 362, 367.

were present, recommends instructions to Mr. Grenville "to make propositions of peace to the belligerent powers upon the basis of independence to the thirteen colonies in North America, and of the treaty of Paris," [to which might be added the Cabinet minute of the 23d of May, instructing Mr. Grenville to propose the independence of America in the first instance, instead of making it the condition of a general treaty.]

Whatever may have been the nature and extent of the differences between Lord Shelburne and Mr. Fox, and whatever may be thought of the grounds of complaint against Lord Shelburne, there can be no doubt, after reading the preceding letters, that differences of opinion, suspicions of underhand dealing, and hostile cabals and intrigues, and great resentment thereupon, subsisted in the minds of Mr. Fox and Mr. Grenville; and the bare existence of such differences unquestionably persuaded Mr. Fox, that the public business of the country, and yet more particularly the negotiations for peace, could not be conducted with advantage, with such dissensions and jealousies, either between the two Secretaries of State, to whose hands the official correspondence was intrusted, or between a Secretary of State and Prime Minister, who received the King's pleasure upon them. It was upon that conviction—surely not unreasonable—that his resignation was grounded, and upon it the vindication of that step must rest.

[IRISH CORRESPONDENCE.]

The difficulties which the Rockingham Administration had to encounter in their endeavors to preserve peace and restore tranquillity in Ireland, and their merit in overcoming these difficulties, which was chiefly effected by the confidence in their principles and character, will be made apparent by the following letters and correspondence from Irish patriots as well as from men in office.

EXTRACT FROM A LETTER OF LORD CHARLEMONT TO MR. FOX.[1]

"DUBLIN, 11*th April*, 1782.

"No man can be more rejoiced than I am at this late happy though tardy change. I rejoice in it as a friend to individuals, but more especially as a member of the empire at large, which will probably be indebted to it for its salvation. I hope, also, and doubt not, that I shall have reason to rejoice in it as an Irishman, for I cannot conceive that they who are intent upon the great work of restoring the empire, should not be ardently attentive to the real welfare of all its parts; or that *true Whigs*, genuine lovers of liberty, whose principles I know, honor, and strive to imitate, should not wish to diffuse this invaluable blessing through every part of those dominions whose interests they are called upon to administer. The appointment of the Duke of Portland, and of his secretary, is a good presage. I know and respect their principles, and should be truly unhappy if anything in their conduct respecting this country should prevent my perfect co-operation with them. For, my dear Sir, with every degree of affection for our sister kingdom, with every regard for the interests of the empire at large, I am an *Irishman;* I pride myself in the appellation, and will in every particular act as such, at the same time declaring that I most sincerely and heartily concur with you in thinking that the interests of England and of Ireland cannot be distinct; and that therefore, in acting as an Irishman, I may always hope to perform the part of a true Englishman also.

"With regard to what you hint respecting an adjournment, I

[1] [The letter of Mr. Fox, to which Lord Charlemont's is a reply, has been published in Hardy's Life of Lord Charlemont (p. 217); and so also is Lord Charlemont's answer, from which the following extracts, taken from the original in Lord Charlemont's handwriting, are printed, partly on account of their connection with those important events that follow, and partly on account of a slight omission in Mr. Hardy's edition of the latter.]

sincerely hope it will not be desired, as the matter seems to me to involve some great, not to say insurmountable difficulties. The eyes of all the nation are eagerly fixed on the meeting of the 16th. The House is convened for that day by this very particular summons, that *every member should attend, as he tenders the rights of Parliament.* The declaration of independent legislature is on that day to be agitated. It is expected by the people with the most anxious impatience, and the minds of all men are so fixed upon the event of that day, which they have every reason to imagine will be favorable to their wishes, that I should greatly fear the consequence of any postponement, especially as, from sad experience, the people have been taught to suppose that a question postponed is, at the least, weakened. This too is an act of the House, and of the House alone. Government has nothing to say to it, nor will any popularity be gained to the Administration which may happen to be present at the carrying this question. On the contrary, success will be looked upon rather as a defeat than as voluntary acquiescence. Such are the difficulties which occur. However, though they may appear insuperable, so strong is our wish not to throw any unnecessary obstacle in the way of the present Administration, that we shall wait to be determined by events.

"I have seen Grattan, and have communicated the kind paragraph in your letter respecting him. He desires his most sincere thanks for your goodness and friendly opinion of him. We are both of us precisely of the same mind. We respect and honor the present Administration. We adore the principle on which it is founded. We look up to its members with the utmost confidence, for their assistance in the great work of general freedom, and should be happy in our turn to have it in our power to support them in Ireland in the manner which may be most beneficial to them, and most honorable to us; consulted but not considered. The people at large must indeed entertain a partiality for the present Ministers. True Whigs must rejoice at the prevalence of Whiggish principles. The nation wishes to support the favorers of American freedom, the men who opposed the detested, the ex-

ecrated American war. Let *our rights* be acknowledged and secured to us—those rights which no man can controvert, but which to a *true Whig* are self-evident—and that nation, those lives and fortunes which are now universally pledged for the emancipation of our country, will be as cheerfully, as universally pledged for the defence of our sister kingdom, and for the support of an Administration which will justly claim the gratitude of a spirited and grateful people, by having contributed to the completion of all their wishes.

"I am, &c.

"CHARLEMONT."

The affairs of Ireland were in the department of Lord Shelburne, with whom of course all official communication was carried on by the Irish government. But while Mr. Fitzpatrick, who was Chief Secretary, remained in Dublin, there was a continual interchange of letters between him and his friend Mr. Fox. Some letters have also been preserved of the Duke of Portland, who was Lord Lieutenant. From these materials such extracts will be made as throw light on the views and opinions of the parties on Irish affairs.

EXTRACT OF A LETTER FROM MR. FOX TO MR. FITZPATRICK.

13*th April*, 1782.

"I have had a great deal of conversation this morning with the Duke of Leinster, who seems to me to talk reasonably enough upon the affairs of Ireland. Two things in particular that he said I think very well worth your attention. One is an idea which he started of having a bill in Ireland similar to that which Crewe moves here, which, he says, besides the popularity of it, would be of incredible advantage to the revenue. If it is liked, I really think it unexceptionable, for the more independently Parliament is chosen the more inclined it will be to support good government. The other is a scheme of something like a Cabinet Council. He describes the want of concert and system which comes from the want of such a thing, to be very detrimental in

every respect, and particularly in parliamentary operations, where those who wish to support Government often do not know till the moment what is the plan proposed, and consequently are wholly unable to support it either systematically or effectually. Another great inconvenience, which he attributes to this want, is that the Lord Lieutenant, not having any regular Ministry to apply to, is driven, or at least led, to consult Lees and such sort of inferior people, and by that means the whole power is (as it was here) centred in the Jenkinsons and Robinsons, &c., of that country. Nobody is responsible but the Lord Lieutenant and his secretary; they know they are to go away, and consequently all the mischiefs ensue that belong to a government without responsibility.[1] I have not talked with anybody upon this, nor indeed had time to think it over myself, but it really strikes me as a matter very well worth weighing, and I wish the Duke of Portland and you would turn your minds to it, especially if, as I take for granted, this idea was suggested to the Duke of Leinster by other considerable men on your side of the water. I have only stated it to you as it strikes me, upon first hearing the thing broached."

EXTRACT FROM A LETTER OF MR. FOX TO MR. FITZPATRICK.

"*April* 15, 1782.

"I have seen a long letter from Mr. Ogilvie to the Duke of Richmond, containing a very detailed account of a conversation with Lord Charlemont, which I do not much like. It seemed that Lord C. wished exceedingly that we should take some step towards the repeal of the act of 6th George I., before anything else was done or attempted. I mention this to you, that pains may be taken to explain why that was not done, viz., that it was perfectly inconsistent with the intention of entering into a treaty to settle finally the future connection between the two countries, to take any step at all, previous to the opening of that treaty; and you will

[1] It is curious to see the question of "responsible government" started in Ireland more than half a century before it was a watchword in Canada. —J. R.

observe that this same reason applies to the not passing of Yelverton's Bill. I dare say it was unnecessary to say all this to you, but I am really so anxious for the success of your Administration, and have such a dread of being upon ill terms with persons so like ourselves in their ways of thinking, as Lord Charlemont and Grattan, that I cannot forbear thinking and writing about it constantly."

MR. FITZPATRICK TO MR. FOX.

"DUBLIN CASTLE, *April* 17, 1782.

"DEAR CHARLES:—

"I shall begin my letter with giving you a caution concerning the communication of its contents too generally on your side of the water, and with another, respecting the confidential letters you write me, which you had better never trust to the post, as we have the misfortune of being here in the hands of the tools of the last Government, and there is even reason to suspect that our letters may be opened before they reach us. I wish you, therefore, to trust them only in the hands of messengers; it is amazing how deep a root the *interior Cabinet* had taken; and you will, I dare say, soon find that you have not extirpated it effectually by the removal of its principal members. If you have time to read it, I shall give you a short account of my proceedings here, and of the opinions I have formed of the state of things. The first person I saw after landing, before I could go out to pay my *devoirs* at the castle, was Charles Sheridan, and as I knew his connections with Grattan, I was glad of an opportunity of learning his intentions at the meeting of Parliament, which Sheridan assured me were by no means whatever to consent to the adjournment. I informed him of our proceedings in England, and used every argument possible to induce him to postpone his declaratory resolutions, which I desired Sheridan to convey to him, and at the same time expressed a wish, if he did not object to it, to see him. I then went to Lord Charlemont, to whom I delivered Lord Rockingham's letter, who, with the utmost degree of kindness and cordiality,

expressed his perfect confidence in Administration; but told me he had just left a meeting at Grattan's, where it had been determined to consent to no adjournment, as they considered themselves pledged to the public positively to bring forward their declaratory resolutions on that day.

"My having made my first application to Lord Charlemont (as I foresaw it must) gives much offence to the supporters of the late Government, notwithstanding which I determined to continue my negotiation with Grattan, in order, if possible, to dissuade him from bringing forward his resolutions; he had with great civility declined meeting me, at least, till after the 16th, and persisted in his intention of consenting to no adjournment, unless the Duke of Portland would pledge himself that all the claims of Ireland should be agreed to: urging, that the question being sure of passing both Houses unanimously, whatever his confidence might be in the new Government, he should be responsible to the public should any of their claims, upon coming into discussion, be afterwards refused. I complained of the hardship of their giving us no more confidence than they would have done the last Government had it continued; upon this, he said he would consent to waive his resolutions, and throw them into the form of an address, which he would send me a copy of, in answer to the message it was supposed the Duke of Portland would bring to the House, and which he considered as a mode less harsh and offensive to the English Parliament than the intended resolutions. In the mean time I saw the Chancellor and the Speaker of the House of Commons, the former of whom I believe an honest man, but the latter the most undisguised rogue I ever met with. He is much in the councils of the popular leaders, and urges them on to every excess of violence, for the sake of popularity I suppose. This is no small inconvenience, as, in all the House of Commons business, we cannot avoid being very much in his hands. I had information from several quarters, that many supporters of the last Administration were all this time very busy in endeavoring to indispose the minds of people towards the new Ministers, and grounded their suspicions of them on the newspaper representation of your speech, which contained

some exceptional expressions; for the very mention of the words, supremacy of England, is enough to inflame this country in its present ferment. This was the situation of things on Sunday when the Duke arrived; the time before the meeting being so short, he determined to converse with and consult as many persons of all descriptions as possible upon the state of affairs, and the probability of an adjournment being obtained, and they universally pronounced it impracticable. Mr. Grattan's address was conceived in such peremptory terms, and the claims contained in it were so extensive, that the Duke of Portland very wisely, I think, declined agreeing to its being moved, and the Provost and Speaker (the latter of whom I know to have seen and approved of Grattan's address, though he pretended to lament extremely its violence) undertook to draw up another, which should contain the same substance, but be softer in the expression, and which, if moved by some person authorized by us, might be preferred to the more violent one; this they accordingly did; but as its being moved on our part would have absolutely pledged the Duke of Portland to support all the claims contained in it, it was judged more expedient simply to move a common address in answer to the message, and afterwards submit to the torrent of the times; which prevented a single man's daring to open his lips against any part of Grattan's amendment, though not a few, even of the most independent men, were known to disapprove of parts of it; some as to the modification of Poynings's law, and still more to the claim of final judicature. You will see a short account of the debate pretty accurately drawn up by one of the under secretaries. Debate indeed it can hardly be called, since that implies a free discussion; and upon this occasion no one man presumed to call in question a single word advanced by Grattan, and spoke only to congratulate Ireland on her emancipation, as they called it, and to load the mover from every quarter of the House with the grossest and most fulsome adulation. Grattan's speech was splendid in point of eloquence, all declamation; very little, and what there was, weak, argument; his manner, I think, though certainly very animated, affected to the last degree. Though the

Duke of Portland has been very cautious to keep himself clear from being considered as pledged in the smallest degree, every body seems completely happy, and considers the whole matter as concluded.

"Upon the whole of this business I see the matter in a gloomy point of view; you have sent us upon a hopeless errand; for it was too late even to prevail upon them to consider for a moment what they were doing, and the real truth is, that there is no existing government in this country. This is, I firmly believe, in consequence of Lord Carlisle and Mr. Eden's having, under the auspices of Lord Hillsborough, *conducted the affairs of this kingdom with no discredit to his Majesty's Government, and with many increasing advantages to both kingdoms.* The House of Lords have gone through the same ceremony to-day. Charles Sheridan thinks all this mighty fine, and very promising; so, I dare say, will his brother; so far, however, I agree with the latter, that the repeal of the 6th of George I. must absolutely be complied with, right or wrong.

"But what to me appears the worst of all is that, unless the heat of the volunteers subsides, I dread Grattan's. For, though everybody seems to agree that he is honest, I am sure he is an enthusiast, and impracticable as the most impracticable of our friends in the Westminster Committee; his situation is enough to turn the head of any man fond of popular applause, but the brilliancy of it can only subsist by carrying points in opposition to Government; and though he chose to make a comparison yesterday between Ireland and America, giving the preference to his own country, I confess I think the wise, temperate, systematic conduct of the other, if adopted by Ireland, would bring all these difficulties to a very short and happy conclusion, to the satisfaction and advantage of both parties. Lord Shelburne's speech gives great satisfaction here, and probably if there had been any chance of soothing this country into moderation, would have done infinite mischief. It is curious enough that while he is recommending us to support the authority of England more than we

either can or, I think, ought to do, he should be declaring in the House of Lords that the claims of Ireland *must* be acceded to.

"You will probably be anxious in England at not having heard an account sooner, but the Duke of Portland has been writing a very full account of everything, and the wind has been constantly adverse. I hope, however, you will be speedy in your resolutions. I promise you the case admits of no delay. The House of Commons is adjourned to Monday, and perhaps they will immediately proceed to bring in bills for these purposes. Long debates in your Cabinet upon these matters will be very dangerous.

"Adieu.

"Yours affectionately,

"R. F."

"P. S. Since writing all this, I have received a message from Grattan, through Sheridan, and shall see him to-morrow; from Sheridan's conversation I have better hopes than I had conceived; for Grattan is of opinion to let us proceed without hurry, and wait till we hear from you, and, besides that, I believe that, from having changed the mode from resolutions to address, he considers some part of the matter as still open to fair discussion, not, however, the repeal of George I.; certainly, however, he seems strongly disposed to abate at least the rapidity of his proceedings, and I am convinced that the real disposition of Ireland is to an indissoluble connection."

[It is very evident from this clear and circumstantial letter, that to obtain an adjournment of the Irish Parliament before some resolution or address, declaratory of the claims of the Irish people, had been carried, was become impracticable. It had been thought otherwise by some members of the English Government. Lord Shelburne, in a letter to Mr. Fitzpatrick, written before what had passed in Ireland was known in England, seems to think it still possible to prevail on the Irish Parliament to adjourn without the previous discussion of these questions.] "As to your affairs," he says, in a letter to Mr. Fitzpatrick, of the 19th of April, "it will give me a bad opinion of Mr. Grattan's head, who

am inclined to have a very good one both of his head and heart, if he objects to the adjournment. The only thing I fear of you, is giving way too easily. It is incredible how much is got by arguing and persevering. Tell them that peace may be made in a moment, and it behooves them to make the most of the instant, and conclude on reasonable terms. I beseech you, above all things, be distinct and explicit."

[After these efforts of the Lord-Lieutenant and of his Secretary, to procure an adjournment of the Irish Parliament, till they had instructions from England how to act, it is not a little surprising that Mr. Dundas should have ventured to assert in the English House of Commons, that the address moved by Mr. Grattan originated from the Irish Government. A flat contradiction to this assertion was given to this on the spot by Mr. Fitzpatrick; and the following letter of Mr. Grattan, of a later date, not only places the matter beyond a doubt, but explains the motives of his pertinacity on that occasion.]

MR. GRATTAN TO MR. FITZPATRICK.

"*March* 21, 1785.

"DEAR SIR:—

"I was favored a few days ago with your letter of the 10th.[1] I had, before I received it, intended to have taken some opportunity in debate to declare what I did in private to several gentlemen, that the Address of the 16th of April, 1782, did not originate with Government; that the Duke of Portland's Administration had *expressly* informed me that they were not responsible for it, either to England or to Ireland; that, therefore, it could not be moved as an original address in answer to the King's message; that if I chose to move it by way of amendment, I might, but the Administration could not, and would not, be responsible for it. So little did I conceive the then Government originating the Address of the 16th of April, 1782, that I went to the House under

[1] Published in Memoirs of Mr. Grattan, vol. ii. p. 276.

some apprehension of an opposition to it from them. Their object, I recollect, was adjournment, as my object was not to lose one hour, inasmuch as I knew perfectly well that the Government could not defeat us. I considered the principles of your Administration very benign to our rights; but I know you did not wish at that period specifically to pledge the English Government to anything.

"In this manner I stated the transaction, which is exactly as your letter represents. Mr. Fitzgibbon could not know it; he had not then the smallest wish to misstate, but was not circumstantially apprised of the transaction."

The day after Mr. Fitzpatrick's letter of the 17th, Mr. Grattan wrote to Mr. Fox.[1]

"*April* 18, 1782.

"SIR:—

"I shall make no apology for writing; in the present posture of things I should rather deem it necessary to make an apology for not writing. Ireland has sent an Address, stating the causes of her discontents and jealousies; thus the question between the two nations becomes capable of a specific final settlement. We are acquitted of being indefinite in discontents and jealousy; we have stated the grounds of them, and they are those particulars in which the practical constitution of Ireland is diametrically opposite to the principles of British liberty. *A foreign legislation, a foreign judicature, a legislative Privy Council,* and a *perpetual army.* It is impossible for any Irishman to be reconciled to any part of such a constitution, and not to hold in the most profound contempt the constitution of England. Thus you cannot reconcile us to your claim of power, without making us dangerous to your liberty; and you also will, I am confident, allow that, in stating such enormities as just causes of discontents and jealousy, we have asked *nothing which is not essential to our liberty.* Thus we have gained another

[1] Published in the Life of Mr. Grattan, by his son, vol. ii. pp. 243–248.

step in the way to a settlement. We have defined our desires and limited them, and committed ourselves only to *what is indispensable to our freedom;* and have this further argument, that you have thought it indispensable to *yours.* One question then only remains—whether what is necessary for us to have, is safe and honorable to Great Britain?

"The perpetual Mutiny Law, and the legislative power exercised by the councils of both kingdoms, it is scarcely necessary to dwell upon, inasmuch as I make no doubt you hold them to be mischievous or useless to England. The legislative power of the Council can't be material to the connection, though the necessity of passing bills under the seal of Great Britain may be so. The power of suppressing in the Irish, and of altering in the English Council, never has been useful to England; on the contrary, frequently the cause of embarrassment to British Government. I have known Privy Councillors agree to bills in Parliament, and in Council alter them materially by some strong clause inserted to show their zeal to the King, at the expense of the popularity of Government. In England, an Attorney-General, or his clerk, from ignorance, or corruption, or contempt, may, and often has, inserted clauses in Irish bills which have involved Irish Governments in lasting consequences with the people; for you must see that a servant of Government in Great Britain, uninformed of the passions of Ireland, may, in the *full exercise* of legislative power, do irreparable mischief to his King and country, without being responsible to either.

"I could mention several instances, but a Mutiny Bill rendered perpetual is a sufficient one, to show how impolitic that law, which commits the machine of the constitution and the passions of the human mind, to the hand of one man. The negativing our bills is a right never disputed; the poisoning them is a practice we do most ardently deprecate, from sound reason and sad experience. I brought to Parliament a list of the alterations made, for the last ten years, in Irish bills by the Privy Council or Attorney-General, and there was not a single alteration made upon a sound legislative motive; sometimes an alteration to vex the Presbyterians,

made by the bishops; sometimes an alteration made by an overzealous courtier, to make Government obnoxious, and to render himself at the same time peculiarly acceptable to the King; sometimes an alteration from ignorance, and not seldom for money.

"I shall, therefore, suppose the power of the Council no object to a principled Administration, and no vital question between the two kingdoms. We shall have then cleared the way to the great question of supremacy; for I conceive the legislative and judicative supremacy to be one question. If you retain the legislative power, you must reserve the final determination of law, because you alone will determine the law, in support of your claim; whereas, if you cede the claim, the question of judicature is one of private property, not national ascendency, and becomes as useless to you as it is opprobrious to us. Besides, there are circumstances which render the appellant judicature to you the most precarious thing imaginable. The Lords of Ireland have on their journals a resolution, that they are ready to receive appeals; so that, after the final settlement with England, if the judicature was not included, any attorney might renew the contest. The decrees of the Lords of England, and of the King's Bench likewise affecting Ireland, are executed *by the officers of the Courts of Justice of Ireland.* The judges of Ireland are now independent. Two of the barons, or judges, may put a total stop to the judicature of the Lords of England, by refusing to lend the process of their Courts; so that, in order to determine your final judicature, it would be unnecessary to go further than the authority of a few judges, independent of England by their tenure, dependent on Ireland by their residence, and perhaps influenced by conscience and by oath. Besides, the 6th of George I. is enacting, as to the appealing, as well as the judicative power. If the former part stands, we are divested of our supreme judicature by an actual exercise of your supreme legislative power, and then a partial repeal would be defective upon principles legislative, as well as jurisdictive. You can't cede your legislative claim, and enjoy your jurisdictive under its authority and exercise; and the whole law must (if the claim of legislature is ceded) fall totally. The

question then between the two nations is thus reduced to one point: Will England cede the claim of supremacy? You seem willing to cede it. Your arguments have led to it. When I say *your* arguments, I mean the liberal and enlightened part of England. Both nations, by what they have said—one by what it has admitted, and the other by what it has asserted—have made the claim of England impracticable. The reserve of that claim of course becomes unprofitable odium, and the relinquishment is an acquisition of affection without a loss of power. Thus the question between the two nations is brought to a mere punctilio: Can England cede with dignity? I submit she can; for if she has consented to enable his Majesty to repeal all the laws respecting America, among which the Declaratory Act is one, she can with more majesty repeal the Declaratory Act against Ireland, who has declared her resolution to stand and fall with the British nation, and has stated her own rights by appealing not to your fears, but your magnanimity. You will please to observe in our Address a veneration for the pride, as well as a love for the liberty of England. You will see in our manner of transmitting the Address, we have not gone to Castle with volunteers as in 1779. It was expedient to resort to such a measure with your *predecessors* in office. In short, Sir, you will see in our requisition nothing but what is essential to the liberty and composure of our country, and consistent with the dignity and interest of the other. These things granted, your Administration in Ireland will *certainly* meet with great support. I mean national as well as parliamentary. In consequence of these things, some laws will be necessary—an act to quiet property held under *former* judgments or decrees in England; a Mutiny Bill; a Bill to modify Poynings's Law. Possibly it might be judicious that some of these should be moved by the Secretary here—it would contribute to his popularity. It will be perhaps prudent to adjourn to some further day, until the present Administration have formed.

"Before I conclude, I will take the liberty to guard you against a *vulgar artifice*, which the *old Court* (by that I mean the *Carlisle faction*) will incline to adopt. They will perhaps write to Eng-

land false suggestions, that Ireland will be satisfied with less, and that the Irish Administration are sacrificing to Irish popularity British rights, and then they will instigate Ireland to stand upon her *ultimatum*, and thus embarrass Government and betray the people. I know this practice was adopted in Lord Buckingham's Administration, by men mortified by his frugality.

"Might I suggest, if you mean (as I am well inclined to believe, and shall be convinced by the success of our application) a Government by privilege; that it would be very beneficial to the character of your Government in Ireland, to dismiss from their official connections with Government some *notorious consciences*, to give a visible, as well as real, integrity to his Majesty's Councils in Ireland, and to relieve them from a certain treachery in men, who will obey you and betray you.

"It would be prudent to exhibit to the public eye a *visible* constitutional Administration. The people here have a personal antipathy to some men here who were the agents of former corruption, and would feel a vindictive delight in the justice of discarding them. When I say this, I speak of a measure not necessary absolutely, if the requisitions are complied with, but very proper and very necessary to elevate the character of your Government, and to protect from treachery your consultations; and when I say this, it is without any view to myself, who, under the constitutional terms set forth, am willing to take any part in the Administration, provided it is not emolumentary. Your minister here will find very great opportunities for vigorous retrenchment, such as will not hazard him in the House of Commons, and may create an enthusiasm in his favor without doors.

"I am running into immoderate length, and beg to conclude with assurances of great constitutional hopes, and personal admiration, and am, with great respect,

"Your most humble and obedient servant,

"H. GRATTAN."

MR. FOX TO MR. GRATTAN.[1]

"GRAFTON STREET, *April* 27, 1782.

"SIR:—

"I have received the honor of your letter of the 18th inst., and am exceedingly obliged to you for it. The business of Ireland becomes so very important that it would be very imprudent in me (especially as it is not within my department) to give any direct opinion upon the various points which make the subject of your letter. What I do think myself at liberty to say is, that it is my ardent wish that matters may be so settled as to give satisfaction to both countries; and above all, that whatever settlement is made, may be so made as to preclude all future occasions of dispute between two nations upon whose mutual union the prosperity of both so unquestionably depends. That as close a connection may subsist between us as the nature of the case will admit, must be my wish as an Englishman. That this connection may be such as may consist with the liberty and happiness of Ireland, I must wish as a Whig, and as one who professes to hold the natural rights of mankind far more sacred than any local prejudices whatever. I am sure I share those feelings in common with your Lord-Lieutenant and his Secretary, and if ever you should think it worth while to inquire into my political sentiments upon any point, you may always be pretty sure of them when you know those of these two persons. With respect to the last part of your letter, I can have no scruple to say, that it gives me the greatest degree of pleasure; because whatever measures may be pursued, I am certain no Government can have the confidence of the people while it has the misfortune to reckon the most brilliant talents, and the most respectable characters, among the number of its opponents. I differ very widely indeed from Mr. Eden, who seems to consider an opposition of less importance in proportion to the virtue and character of those who compose it. Pray give my best respects to Lord Charlemont, and believe me to be, with great truth and regard, &c.,

"C. J. FOX."

[1] Published in the Life of Mr. Grattan, by his son, vol. ii. p. 252.

With the answer to Mr. Grattan was sent the following letter to Mr. Fitzpatrick:—

"St. James's, *April* 28, 1782.

"My dear Dick:—

"As I understand a messenger is to go to-night to Ireland, I shall send this by him, and can therefore write with entire confidence upon the affairs of both kingdoms. First, with respect to those of Ireland, I am sadly afraid that we do not understand one another rightly. You seem to expect, and to be impatient for a determination from hence, while we rather wait for further suggestions from the Duke of Portland. His last letter, though a most excellent account and description of what had passed at Dublin, does not contain or even hint at the measures he wishes to be pursued, so that we are in point of future measures just where we were when he left us. It would have been very lucky if he had explained, whether he thought it advisable to enter into any treaty with Ireland, and if he did, what mode of treating would be most pleasing. If nothing of this sort is to take place, I wish he had suggested what steps he could wish to be taken here, whether a mere repeal of the 6th of George I. would do. I own I still adhere to my opinion, that giving way in everything, without any treaty or agreement which shall be binding upon both countries, can answer no end but that of obtaining quiet for a few months. You know how strongly some people here object to a Parliamentary Commission, and yet I see no other tolerable way out of the business. We who are for it should have been very much strengthened, if we had had the Duke of Portland's opinion for such a measure; and if it is not his opinion, we should have been glad to relinquish it and to adopt his ideas, if we knew them. As the matter now stands, I am very apprehensive of misunderstandings. The answer to the Address ought neither to please nor displease any, otherwise than as the laying of the addresses before the English Parliament certainly seems to look to the repeal of English statutes. But when they are laid, you will probably expect us to take some step upon them; whereas we think, we

ought to wait till something is done with you, or at least till we hear from you. My opinion is clear for giving them all that they ask, but for giving it them so as to secure us from further demands, and at the same time to have some clear understanding with respect to what we are to expect from Ireland, in return for the protection and assistance which she receives from those fleets which cost us such enormous sums, and her nothing. If they mean really well to their country, they must wish some *final adjustment* which may preclude further disputes; if they mean nothing but consequence to themselves, they will insist upon these points being given up, simply without any reciprocal engagement, and as soon as this is done, begin to attack whatever little is left in order to continue the ferment of the country. In one word, what I want to guard against is Jonathan Wild's plan of seizing one part in order to dispute afterwards about the remainder. I have had a long letter from Grattan, a copy of which I send you inclosed. I like very much the latter part of it, and approve quite of his idea of removing obnoxious persons, or, as he calls them, in his very strange and affected language, *notorious consciences*. Unless you can give your Government quite a different face from that of your predecessors you cannot make that figure which you ought to do; and though I do not understand rightly what share it is that Grattan means to take in it, yet if you can make him take any, I am sure it must be of infinite utility. The *people* of every country always do, and always must look to *men*, and will never believe you to be cordial in adopting any measure as long as you continue in hostility with the friends to it, and in friendship with its enemies. You will observe that a great part of his letter is spent upon the *judicial supremacy* of England, the retaining of which, in a national view, I do not think worth one farthing when the legislative is gone. Many people think it better for Ireland that it should remain; if so, let the Irish desire it, not we to whom it can be of no importance. I have inclosed you my answer to Grattan, which is perfectly general, but which I hope he will not consider on that account as unfriendly, because he must see how very improper it would be

in me to give him my opinion upon such important points, before that of the Lord-Lieutenant and the rest of the King's servants is declared. I do not think the difficulties upon commercial points will be great, nor do I believe the interests of the countries can clash in that respect more than in others, if they are considered with any degree of enlargement and liberality. Grattan seems to be very willing to give time; but the misfortune is, that till we hear more from you we do not know what use to make of that time."

From this period the affairs of Ireland began to brighten. On the same day that Mr. Fox complained to Mr. Fitzpatrick of the silence of the Irish Government on the measures to be adopted in England, the Duke of Portland wrote to him as follows :—[1]

"Dublin Castle, *April* 28, 1782.

"My dear Sir :—

"Lord Strangford is a very poor and a very *shabby* peer, but I will let him know that you have sent me his letter, and that his application shall be attended to at a proper time. I have written so fully to Lord Shelburne that it is almost unnecessary for me to trouble you upon the same subject; but, as I conceive somewhat better hopes than I would venture to express to Lord S., and as I know that that circumstance will not induce *you* or the *some of you* to delay or to haggle, I may own to you, that I do not believe the people of this country inexorable or determined to reject all ideas of *treaty*. I do not mean to say that some preliminaries need not be granted before the negotiation takes place, because I am convinced that they will not listen to any propositions until the independence of the legislature is promised, and the necessary (for so it appears to me, as an Englishman) alteration of their Mutiny Bill is agreed to. These two points conceded, and an engagement on your parts to enter into a fair discussion for the pur-

* Published, with inconsiderable omissions, in the Life of Mr. Grattan, by his son, vol. ii. p. 272.

pose of settling the judicature and Poynings's Law, would, I believe, compose their spirits and incline them to adopt measures and modes of treating, without which I do not see a possibility of terminating the business. I foresee very considerable difficulties in drawing the line of that independence which I advise to be conceded, and for which they so earnestly contend, and I must add, that the embarrassment will increase every day the question is kept open; but yet I am sanguine enough to hope that an appearance of the sincerity, which I am sure *our* friends possess, would go a great way in removing the difficulties which this state of suspense tends daily to create. Fitzpatrick has sent you as regular information as the wind would permit; but without being upon the spot, I will venture to say, that no man can judge of or foresee the variations, or rather advancement, in the demands and expectations which frequently occur to us. I am more sanguine than he is inclined to be, and to expect more from the two concessions I recommend to be speedily made, than he thinks me authorized or entitled to hope for. I foresee great difficulties on your side in consenting, and on this in accepting anything less than the immediate repeal of the 6th of George I.; and yet I would not despair of some middle term being thought of which would answer the purpose, if I was instructed to assure them that the independence of their legislature would certainly be conceded, that is, supported, in Parliament by the present Ministry. I had some conversation with Grattan upon the mode. He was very reasonable, and professed the strongest disposition to accommodate, saying *that his reason for preferring the Address to resolutions was, that he thought the Parliament of Ireland less pledged to adherence by the one than the other.* He also insisted upon the necessity of any concession on the part of England being considered here as matter of favor; that it was the duty of this country to consult *our honest pride,* and that if the language did not afford words that would reconcile our feelings to the measures we might think it right to adopt, in the present crisis, words should be made for the purpose. He suggested that the preamble of an act for granting the independence of the Irish legislature (not absolutely insisting upon

the repeal of 6th of George I., but certainly not pointing out any mode by way of substitution) might run, 'Whereas it is *rightful*,' conceiving that the ambiguous sense of that word might gratify the feelings of the two countries. Our conference was interrupted by a foolish ceremony that could not be avoided, and I have not seen him since till the levee of to-day, when I desired an early opportunity of renewing the discourse, to which he most readily assented. I have given you an exact account of the parts of the conversation which have given rise to my expectations. Fitzpatrick thinks they go too far; but I leave you and *our* friends to draw their own inferences. I should myself be fearful of these effects elsewhere. I will not now detain you any longer; but I cannot conclude this letter without expressing to you my most anxious wishes for a speedy and favorable determination. There is still *an appearance* of Government; but if you delay, or refuse to be liberal, Government cannot exist here in its present form, and the sooner you recall your Lieutenant, and renounce all claim to this country, the better; but, on the contrary, if you can bring your minds to concede largely and handsomely, I am persuaded that you may make any use of this people, and of everything they are worth, that you can wish; and in such a moment it will be happy for them that the Government of England shall be in hands that will not take undue advantage of their intoxication.

"Ever most sincerely yours, &c.,

"PORTLAND."

[Intelligence having arrived in London that the Irish Parliament had adjourned on the 4th of May, Mr. Fox wrote to Mr. Fitzpatrick in better spirits, so far as Irish affairs were concerned.]

MR. FOX TO MR. FITZPATRICK.

"*May* 11, 1782.

"We had just made up our minds to bring on the Irish business in Parliament here, when the Duke of Portland's dispatch of the 5th of this month arrived. The news it contained

of adjournment of your Parliament, and the expectation it gave of another letter soon from the Duke, have induced us to wait till we hear again from you. I really begin to have hopes that this business will terminate better than I had expected; and that with a concession of *internal* legislation as a preliminary, accompanied with a modification of Poynings's Law, and of a temporary Mutiny Bill, we may be able to treat of other matters, so amicably, as to produce an arrangement that will preserve the connection between the two countries."

Of the further proceedings in Irish affairs, during the remainder of the summer, there are no documents in the manuscript collections at Holland House. Suffice it to say, that the act of the 6th George I., for the better securing the dependency of the kingdom of Ireland on the Crown of Great Britain, was repealed by the English Parliament, and with this repeal the Irish people and Irish Parliament were at first quite satisfied. But doubts having been started whether claims then abandoned might not be revived, and Lord Mansfield having decided in the Court of King's Bench an Irish cause, which had been brought into his Court before the act of George I. was repealed, all Ireland was again in a flame; insomuch that in the following year it was thought prudent to pass a bill renouncing in the most express terms, on the part of Great Britain, all authority, legislative or judicial, over Ireland. The following letters from Mr. Yelverton and Mr. Grattan, written during Lord Shelburne's Ministry, in which frequent allusions are made to the conduct of Mr. Fox, will show what were the opinions of the best Irish lawyers and patriots on the necessity of this measure.

MR. YELVERTON TO MR. FITZPATRICK.

"*December* 31, 1782.

"Dear Sir:—

"I thank you most sincerely for your kind communication of what passed in the House of Commons, and for giving me an opportunity of explaining my sentiments on the subject. Ever

since you left this kingdom, the doctrine of renunciation has been gaining ground. Almost all the volunteer corps have declared either for that or a Bill of Rights, and so have even two or three county meetings. It was in vain to argue that the national faith was pledged to the repeal of the 6th George I., and that this had all the effect of renunciation, if it was not renunciation itself; for that the 6th George I. was only a judgment pronounced by England in her own favor, and that the repeal of the act was a reversal of the judgment. The people did not understand the subject, and were therefore easily misguided. You know that Mr. Flood's harangues first led them astray, but Lord Beauchamp's pamphlet completed the delusion. You cannot conceive what a mischievous effect that pamphlet produced, particularly in the north. But, notwithstanding all this clamor, I should have been of opinion that every attempt to carry the compact between the two kingdoms one iota beyond the terms agreed upon in the Duke of Portland's Administration, ought to have been resisted, if Lord Mansfield's decision, coming at the time it did, had not given a new turn to affairs. That decision, though in my opinion no violation of the compact, is by many of the best affected men in this country considered as such, and has given very great umbrage, and even taught many to believe that the late adjustment is imperfect, and that something is yet wanting to give it security and force. In order to quiet those jealousies, we could think of nothing better here, than that some act of your Legislature should pass, which should have for its avowed object to deprive the English Courts of the appellate jurisdiction (a measure to which I am glad to find the Attorney-General sees no objection), and which should anticipate Lord Beauchamp on the point of renunciation, by reciting in the preamble that the British Parliament had, by the repeal of the 6th George I., renounced all legislative and judicial *powers* over Ireland; in short, an act, the preamble of which should be the declaration of Mr. Fox, and the measure of the Attorney-General the enacting part; which should not introduce renunciations as anything new, but explain it as a thing already done. If an act of this kind were passed, I have every

reason to believe it would give perfect satisfaction. The people already begin to expect something to this effect, and to express their pleasure at the prospect of seeing it accomplished. The adherents to Grattan will be pleased with it, because it will prove the truth of what they have always asserted, that the British nation was sincere, and that the repeal of the 6th George I. was intended, and did operate as a renunciation; and even the disciples of Flood will not dislike it, because they will claim the credit of it, though without any just foundation. It will set the good faith of England in a conspicuous point of view, and at the same time clap an extinguisher on Irish sedition.

"I agree entirely with the Attorney-General, that the Irish Act for reforming erroneous judgments and decrees has sufficiently secured the final judicature to Ireland; because, as he very truly observed, if a writ of error were to be now brought to remove a cause into England, the Irish judges would pay no regard to it, unless it can be presumed that they would act in open defiance of their own law. And it is also my opinion that Lord Mansfield was, strictly speaking, justifiable in what he did. The practice of removing causes from the Court of King's Bench in Ireland to the Court of King's Bench in England was coeval with the first union of the two kingdoms under one Sovereign. Before the late adjustment took place, an Irish cause had been removed into England, pursuant to this ancient practice. The cause was, therefore, become English; it was a part of the business of Lord Mansfield's court; it was his duty to dispose of it as such, and no law of ours could prevent him from doing so. Besides, the whole proceeding is nugatory. It was so much breath wasted and time misspent; for Lord Mansfield's judgment cannot now be received in this kingdom. But it matters not so much how this proceeding *ought* to operate, as how it really *does* operate. All men are not lawyers. It is, therefore, generally considered as a breach of English faith —it certainly has all the appearance of a breach—and if it is not repaired in some way or other, I fear it will produce all the mischiefs of a real infringement. If the way proposed, or something

like it, be adopted, either Ireland will be happy and contented, or she does not deserve to be so.

"In the accounts which I have seen of the conversation in the House of Commons, I do not think anything seems to be misstated, though I presume the accounts are, on the whole, very imperfect. It gives your friends here great pleasure to find that you still interest yourself in Irish affairs, and that Mr. Fox, in his manly and liberal declaration, has done justice to himself and them. I barely know Mr. Fox's person, and am not at all acquainted with Mr. Burke, but, as I have an ambition to know them both, I beg you may give my compliments to them, and assure them of the great respect in which I hold their characters; without concealing from them, however, that I was once jealous of them for the opinions which I conceived they held upon the affairs of Ireland, though, I am now happy to find, without any just foundation."

MR. GRATTAN TO MR. FITZPATRICK.

"DUBLIN, *January* 5, 1783.

"DEAR SIR:—

"I had the pleasure of receiving a copy of your letter to the Attorney-General. It is fully adequate to the honorable sentiments, and agreeable to the private and public faith, which you have shown in every transaction in which you have been concerned. Mr. Fox's conduct and declaration I must acknowledge and feel; they are liberal to Ireland, and just to those lately concerned in her redemption; and I must say of the Duke of Portland, and those connected with him, that there are no hands in which the government of a country, or the honor of individuals can be more safely deposited.

"As to my sentiments, which you are pleased to inquire after, relative to Irish affairs, they are conformable to Mr. Yelverton's letter, viz., a bill relative to the Judicature, with a preamble explanatory of the repeal. It occurred to me when I read Lord Beauchamp's pamphlet, that when his intended bill was rejected, a resolution might follow, similar to that which we adopted in

Ireland, asserting the independency of the Irish Parliament to have been already recognized by the repeal, and the question of legislature settled thereby.

"Lord Mornington and I have had several conversations on Irish affairs; he is most fully possessed of my mind on all political subjects—a great friend of the Duke of Portland's government, and personally acquainted with, and I believe attached to you. I shall only add my sincere wishes on every public and personal consideration for your health, prosperity, and power, and am, dear Sir,

"Very cordially, with great respect
"And regard,
"Your most humble servant,
"H. GRATTAN."

MR. GRATTAN TO MR. FITZPATRICK.

"Dawson Street, *February* 18, 1783.

"Dear Sir:—

"I most entirely agree with you on the Irish subject, that the measure to be adopted was, to assert the security of the British Parliament against clamor. We had done so by resolution in the Parliament of Ireland, when we rejected Mr. Flood's Bill of Right. Corresponding measures in Great Britain, had supported both Parliaments against the growth of demand, had cut up every road or pretence of doubt. The faith of nations had been vindicated, and those who accused Great Britain of prevarication had not been encouraged. With respect to the bill which I understand is brought in by Government, from what I can collect it is not our idea at all, but does us as great injustice as our merits are capable of receiving. However, where the substance purports repeated security to our freedom, I acquiesce in the formation, however injurious to me.

"I think we had a right to be warranted by the Parliament of England when we vindicated her sincerity; however, we must have no personal feelings on the subject. My language to the

Lord-Lieutenant was, 'consult measures, not men; you will do whatever you think will add to public security or your own ease.' I understand the difficulties to the mode which we desired were started by Lords Thurlow and Ashburton. In short, we were in a situation in which we would not deprecate anything. This was the idea of Yelverton, myself, and some others.

"I most warmly feel your conduct, and that of Mr. Fox, on the day of asking leave to introduce the bill. I lament that the formation of it, and the government of both kingdoms, was not in both your hands. I think, in that case, the confidence we placed in the sincerity of the Parliament of England had been justified and encouraged.

"I should have answered your letter before, but, by an accident, did not receive it until the other day. I request to be remembered to Mr. Fox; and believe me to be, with great sincerity, high esteem, and respect,

"Your most faithful, humble servant,

"H. GRATTAN."

"It is reported here that the Opposition in England are become strong, and that Mr. Fox will come into power. If so, it is not too late; amend the Irish bill according to your own idea."

[Before quitting the subject of Irish politics during the Rockingham Administration, it may not be improper to notice a suggestion made to the Duke of Portland, of obtaining from the Irish Parliament an acknowledgment of the "supremacy of Great Britain in all matters of state and general commerce." This project was devised by Mr. Ogilvie, husband of the Duchess Dowager of Leinster; communicated by him to the Duke of Portland, as a measure in which the leading Irish politicians might be induced to concur; eagerly embraced by the Duke; and conveyed by him to Lord Shelburne, who, in the absence of his colleagues, expressed his own satisfaction with the plan. The scheme, however, turned out to be a mere vision of Mr. Ogilvie's; and it would not deserve to be noticed at all, if it had not been

brought forward by Mr. Pitt, in 1799, as one of his proofs that the Irish settlement of 1782 was not considered as a final measure, even by its authors. The correspondence on this suggestion by Mr. Ogilvie, was read by Mr. Pitt in the House of Commons,[1] and has been republished by Mr. Henry Grattan, in his Memoirs of his father.[2] Mr. Grattan has also reprinted a private letter from Mr. Fitzpatrick to his father, in 1800, giving a history of the transaction, obtained from Mr. Ogilvie; but having omitted his father's reply, it is here subjoined, as not only most characteristic of that most eminent and excellent man, but expressive of his favorable recollections of the fair and open conduct of Mr. Fox in 1782.]

MR. GRATTAN TO THE RIGHT HON. R. FITZPATRICK.

"*February* 14, [1800].

"Dear Sir:—

"Your letter of the 28th I did not get till this moment. Being directed to me as 'Right Honorable,' the Post-Office affected not to know me, and the letter remained either there or at the Parliament House, and came to me this morning with an inscription, 'not known.' I am vexed at not having received it before, because I must have appeared to you dilatory and improper, in not giving it an immediate answer. I am excessively glad to find that you and I entirely concur upon the subject of the Duke of Portland's dispatch. When Mr. Pitt stated it, I was not able to read, and nobody was suffered to speak to me on the subject of public matters. I heard of it after, and had a conversation regarding it with Mr. Fox, who said he believed it a sudden idea of the Duke of Portland's, adopted without communication or consult, and as suddenly dropped. I never saw the Duke's dispatch; but, understanding that he had mentioned a communication with somebody in Ireland on the subject of it, I had a curiosity to inquire, and found, to my astonishment, that it was Mr. Ogilvie.

[1] Hansard's Debates, xxxiv. 977–982.

[2] Memoirs of Henry Grattan, ii. 284–291.

I was not at that time acquainted with Mr. Ogilvie, at least, to the best of my recollection. However, an event of so unimportant a nature as my first acquaintance with him, I may not accurately retain in my memory; but this I accurately remember, that I never permitted myself to be approached by Mr. Ogilvie in the character of a statesman. I have not the least recollection of the transaction he states; but this I know positively, that neither Lord Charlemont nor myself would have communicated with Mr. Ogilvie upon any public business confidentially—least of all, on that which the dispatch refers to. Had the measure been of no consequence, and had we been disposed to it, it was not through such a man as Mr. Ogilvie we should have communicated our sentiments to the Lord-Lieutenant. In short, we would not have talked seriously with Mr. Ogilvie upon any political subject. He was not a member of Parliament; he was not a politician; he was not an Irishman; and he was an entire stranger to me, and, I believe, to my Lord Charlemont.

"Mr. Ogilvie, as the husband of the Duchess of Leinster, was entitled to respect; but, as a statesman, would have exposed himself to much ridicule, and would have exposed any public measure and those who communicated with him. If, therefore, he at that time brought such a proposal, which I have not the least recollection of, we must have marvelled at his presumption, and laughed at his project. I remember, afterwards, in '85, at the time of the propositions, to have had some political communications with him, in common with others of the Opposition, which was at that time very general and numerous. He was at that time in Parliament, in Opposition, and a partisan, who wrote a pamphlet. I recollect, afterwards, I think it was in the year '87, being visited by Mr. Ogilvie, upon his going to England. He came to me, and wished to have my sentiments touching a new Irish Administration, which he imagined at that time he might be able to form, upon seeing his friends in England; and I shall never forget a very obliging and liberal offer which he made me at that time, namely, the place of Chancellor of the Exchequer, and this of his own mere motion, without any authority whatso-

ever from any persons in power. At first, I laughed at the conversation with as much civility as I could, wishing to put an end to such senseless importunity; but, recollecting immediately that he might go to England, and state that I had tolerated his overtures, I told him explicitly that I would take no office under the Crown, being paid by the people. His solution was prompt and ingenious. 'You may take the office, and the salary you may give to your clerk, which I am ready to be.' These are the only political communications I ever recollect to have had with this enlightened statesman; and, from the nature of them, you may see how far he was authorized to undertake, or to say anything for my Lord Charlemont or myself, on the subject of the dispatch by the Duke of Portland, in which the Duke was totally unauthorized, most lamentably weak, and appears to be a poor conspirator against his own measures and against his own Cabinet, in conjunction with a gentleman who would have given an air of ridicule to any measure, and who appears to have been employed to negotiate a business which would have damned the first character in this kingdom.

"I perfectly recollect the conversation you state to have taken place in the House of Commons between you and Mr. Flood, and the very fair and honorable part which you took through the whole of that business; and, however English Cabinets and English Secretaries have sometimes been disingenuous to Ireland, I feel a pleasing recollection, even now, that there were two with whom I was connected, you and Mr. Fox, in whose open dealing our country and all her friends might repose entire confidence.

"Perhaps I shall see you once more. If so, I shall rejoice; if not, I shall always remember you with affection. Remember me to Mr. Fox; tell him I did not stay a moment in London, otherwise I should have gone to see him. I am glad to find that he is so much recovered from that terrible accident.

"The Union I fear will be carried. If it be, it is because the Government will have bought the Parliament, and dragooned the people. I think it will prove ultimately bad for both kingdoms; for it will not be an union of affection nor of honor, but of hatred

and contempt, perfidy and meanness. I thought it better, notwithstanding the infirmity of my head, and my inability to enter into any House of Commons contest, to make an effort, and bear my last testimony for the constitution of '82. I find myself better, but am not yet able to write, and therefore I have gotten a gentleman to write this for me. I conclude by assuring you how sincerely

"I am yours,

"HENRY GRATTAN."

"I am not certain whether we did not dine together at Mr. Ogilvie's in '82; if so, I must have known him at that time; but you will recollect we were then in power, and more likely to be invited by persons we were scarcely acquainted with."

[Mr. Fitzpatrick had previously communicated with Mr. Fox, and had received from him the following account of his recollections of what had passed on this subject in 1782; from which it will be seen that whatever hopes might have been at one time entertained of establishing the connection between the two kingdoms on a more solid and permanent basis than was effected by the settlement of 1782, these hopes were speedily extinguished, and the measures that might have been founded on them entirely abandoned.]

"*February* 19, 1799.

"DEAR DICK:—

"Before I received your letter, the debate between you and Pitt had led me to recollect as much as I could of what passed in 1782; and the contents of the Duke of Portland's private letter are not very different from what I guessed them to be; only as it was a private letter, I should have thought it more likely to have been addressed to Lord Rockingham, or to me, than to Lansdowne. The date of it being anterior to your answer to Flood, in my opinion, sets all right; for I well remember that those hopes, held out by the Duke of Portland, vanished almost as soon as they were communicated, and possibly even before he had an opportunity of conversing with you about them, certainly many days

before your debate with Flood; for if the Duke of Portland would answer truly, I am sure he would say that twenty-four hours, or, as I believe, much fewer, were the term of their duration. Ogilvie was the channel through which they were communicated to him, whose officiousness probably made him act without any authority; and, if I remember right, the Duke of Portland's letter was written in a hurry, just as the dispatches were coming away, before he had time to ascertain the value of Ogilvie's intelligence. I think I had all this in a subsequent conversation from the Duke of Portland; and if there is any mention in the letter, or at that time, about proroguing or not proroguing the Parliament, I suppose that is what Pitt alluded to in another debate. The Duke of Portland could not but communicate such intelligence to us, but neither could he have allowed you to make your speech in answer to Flood without contradiction, unless he had been convinced of the impracticability or ineligibility of what he had before suggested; and, therefore, whether or not the ministers, at the moment it was made, might wish some addition to the settlement, it is evident that within a few days, or at most weeks, they considered it as final. It certainly must have been so understood when the two Parliaments were prorogued without any ulterior measure being announced; and it would be a most insignificant dispute about dates, whether it became to be considered as final at the time of the royal assent being given to the regulations of Poynings's Law, &c., or at the time of your speech, or at that of the prorogation. On the other hand, if ulterior measures were necessary, why were they not taken by the then Ministry? It is true, Lord Rockingham's death, and Lord John's and my resignation, made a considerable change in the Ministry, but with the exception of us three the whole Cabinet remained; and what did Pitt, who became a part of it, hear upon the subject among his colleagues at that time? Why, he heard that another bill was necessary, not for the purpose of *acknowledging the superintending power*, &c., but for the purpose of rendering the complete Independence still more unequivocal, and therefore, according to the present doctrine, of fixing more firmly *that puerile and imprac-*

ticable system, &c. The Coalition Administration succeeded, at the head of which was the very Lord-Lieutenant whose opinions are quoted, and the mover of the second proposition (myself) an active member of it. Yet no ulterior step is taken, and the settlement therefore considered as final. Then comes Pitt himself; no measure taken to remedy this defective system, yet the affairs of Ireland were under his most particular consideration, ay, and the second resolution, too; which, he contended, contained in it something like a tacit promise of his Irish propositions, and yet not a step taken to insure any unity in matters of *state*. As to *general Laws of Commerce*, also, not a word tending to give Great Britain any sort of imperial power in the propositions as he brought them down; and whatever was afterwards proposed on this head, was to obviate objections which had arisen in the course of the transaction. Pitt then, in 1785, having the affairs of Ireland in his view, and particularly adverting to the second resolution of 1782, still considered the settlement as final, and that no imperial power was wanting. Some such power in regard to commerce (but none ever in matters of *state*) he found to be necessary during the course of the debates on the propositions; but this necessity arose only out of the propositions themselves, and not out of the former settlement, and accordingly, when the propositions fell, this necessity ceased likewise, and no measure was proposed by him from 1785 to 1798; though the second resolution is supposed now to have pledged the Houses of Parliament, and the King's answer, delivered by me, to have pledged the executive power to some ulterior measure.

"I do not know whether you are to have another bout with Pitt on this business, nor when the business comes on in the House of Lords. By what you say, I suppose not very soon; but before it does, I wish you would show young one[1] this letter, as it may be of use to him.

"Yours, ever affectionately,

"C. J. F.

"St. Ann's Hill, *Tuesday*."

[1] Lord Holland.

*We now return to the general position of the Ministry. The letters from Mr. Grenville to Mr. Fox will have shown the reader that serious differences existed between Mr. Fox and Lord Shelburne; that those differences were not differences of opinion which time may efface, or further reflection reconcile, or more ample discussion close; but discords arising from want of confidence between man and man; from concealment on the part of Lord Shelburne towards his colleague, and a natural resentment of such distrust on the part of Mr. Fox.

The course of events is related in General Fitzpatrick's Journal.*

"Sunday, June 23, 1782.—Lord Rockingham, whose health declined since his coming into office, was this day taken ill.

"He died on Monday, July 1.

"Previous to this misfortune, the dissensions in the Cabinet had risen to such a height, that on Sunday Charles Fox had notified to the rest of the Ministers his resolution to resign, though probably Lord Rockingham's recovery would have maintained the weight of the Whig party. His resolution to resign was founded upon his having been outvoted in Cabinet, upon the question of acceding *unconditionally* to the independence of America.

"On Tuesday, the day after Lord Rockingham's death, Lord Shelburne announced to the other Ministers that his Majesty had written to him to desire he would accept the Treasury, in such a manner as to make it impossible for him to decline it, though he wished rather it should have been given to a friend of Lord Rockingham. The Whig party in the Cabinet were decidedly of opinion that the Duke of Portland, or some one of Lord Rockingham's known friends, ought to succeed him. Lord Shelburne, finding them so averse to his appointment, begged nothing might be resolved on that day, and undertook to endeavor to dissuade the King, *though he feared he should not be successful.* Lord John Cavendish resolved not to continue Chancellor of the Exchequer, and C. Fox was equally determined to resign the seals; the Duke of Richmond was strenuously of opinion to continue, though he declared he would not do so, unless the rest of Lord Rockingham's friends did the same. Lord Keppel seemed doubtful, and General

Conway strong for continuing, though he thought the appointment of the Duke of Portland would have been more proper. Most of the Whigs out of office were of opinion to resist the appointment of Lord Shelburne; those who held offices for the most part seemed to hesitate, probably influenced by their situations.

"On Wednesday, C. Fox told the King he considered it as his duty to inform him that, in his opinion, the only means of securing the support of those whom he believed to be the firmest friends to his Majesty's Government, was to appoint some person to succeed Lord Rockingham, in whom that description of persons could place their confidence. The King answered, that when he had changed his Ministry, it was his intention to have given the Treasury to Lord Shelburne, who had declined it in favor of Lord Rockingham, and that, consequently, upon his death, it now seemed naturally to devolve upon Lord Shelburne. C. Fox replied that he did not consider Lord Shelburne as a person who would answer the description he had before given.

"The Duke of Richmond continued strenuous against resigning, and soon appeared doubtful whether he should himself do so, though the rest of his friends might. He so far prevailed on C. Fox as to induce him to consent to remain (although he declared he should do it with reluctance) upon condition that Lord J. Cavendish would be Secretary of State. Lord John, however, continued immovable, and on Thursday Charles Fox resigned the seals into his Majesty's hands, telling him that he conceived the appointment of Lord Shelburne to be a departure from the principles upon which they had come into office, and that it would tend to promote that disunion which he had ever considered as the misfortune of his Majesty's reign, by creating distrust and dissatisfaction amongst that description of men whom he believed to be the best friends to his Majesty's family, and to the interests of the public. The King expressed some surprise, and wished him to take time to consider.

"The Prince of Wales dined with Mr. Fox on the day of his resignation, and expressed much kindness towards him, assuring him that he should ever consider Lord Rockingham's friends as

the persons the most to be depended upon, and as the best friends of the country.

"The Duke of Richmond was indefatigable in persuading as many of the Whigs as possible to remain in office, and support Administration till they departed from the principles they professed, though Lord Shelburne had already done it in twenty instances.

"During the short Administration of Lord Rockingham, there were sufficient proofs of Lord Shelburne's intentions of acting in conjunction with the King against the Whigs, whom he had been obliged by the House of Commons and the cry of the nation to admit into his councils. This the Duke of Richmond could not be ignorant of, which leaves his conduct without defence. Lord Keppel continued in office; but it was generally understood that he would do so only to the close of the campaign."

[On the 9th of July, Mr. Fox explained the reasons of his resignation in the House of Commons. His speeches on the occasion seem well reported. But in Mr. Adam's Journal there are some particulars related, which are omitted in the Parliamentary Debates. At a Cabinet held at the Duke of Grafton's, Mr. Fox was outvoted on a point of material importance, the nature of which he could not at that time explain fully to the House, though it was understood to relate to the negotiation for peace he was then carrying on at Paris. On losing this question, he declared to General Conway his intention to resign, but did not mention it to his other colleagues, lest it should be thought he was acting from passion. On the Sunday following, he called another Cabinet at his own house, and submitted the matter to them again. He was outvoted a second time, on which he announced his determination to resign; but suspended the execution of it, lest it should agitate Lord Rockingham, who was dying. Mr. Adam adds, what must have confirmed him in his resolution, that in answer to an application he had made to the King for additional powers to Mr. Grenville, whom he had employed at Paris, his Majesty replied, that "he thought it unnecessary to say anything to Mr. Grenville till Lord Shelburne heard from Mr. Oswald what

the prospects were." This was told to Mr. Adam by Lord Maitland, to whom Mr. Fox had shown the King's letter.]

[There prevailed, also, a material difference of opinion between Mr. Fox and Lord Shelburne, as to the interpretation of a minute of Cabinet, on which instructions had been sent to our diplomatic agents both in France and America. The words of the minute gave authority to "Mr. Grenville to propose the independency of America in the first instance, instead of making it a condition of a general treaty." Mr. Fox maintained that these words contained a complete, final, and absolute recognition of American independence. Lord Shelburne contended that the recognition was meant to be only conditional, depending on the conclusion of a general treaty of peace, and, if peace was not made, that England and America would stand in the same relation to each other as before the negotiation was entered on. Suspicious of some lurking design still entertained of reducing the colonies to their former dependence, Mr. Fox was alarmed at this interpretation of words which he had endeavored to make as clear and explicit as possible, and considered it as laying the ground for such an attempt in case France and Spain could not be brought to reasonable terms.]

We may now refer to Horace Walpole's account of the transaction.

"Lord Rockingham had been unhealthy from his childhood. Ill health, and a frame most nervous, and without vigor, ought to have checked his vanity of desiring to be Prime Minister, for it was vanity rather than ambition. When he obtained his post this second time, he was much more debilitated. His physicians were aware that the fatigue of business would soon destroy him—and it did. In the last days of June, it was known that he was on the point of death, and on July 1 he expired, calmly, and perfectly in his senses." "The King showed his aversion to Lord Rockingham so indecently and unfeelingly, that, though he had accepted him for his Minister, he did not once send to inquire how the Marquis did, when he was dying."

A short recapitulation of the events of Lord Rockingham's life follows; and then Walpole resumes: "It was puerile, though not

strange want of policy in Lord Rockingham's friends, not to have seized the opportunity of his lordship's approaching dissolution, to take measures for naming his successor. He died before there was the least guess in the public who it would be. This looked as if they thought themselves unprovided with any man fit for so arduous a charge. Lord John Cavendish seemed so little prepared for the emergency, that he declared in private that now Lord Rockingham was gone he cared no more about politics. This was his first sensation. His next, and which, though not uppermost on the loss of Lord Rockingham, was nearest to his heart, was that the house of Cavendish ought to have the exclusive right of naming a Prime Minister.[1] Not that the honor of enjoying such exclusive nomination was all that flattered Lord John's vanity. He could not help looking a little in that nomination to the tractability of the person he should name. Disdaining ambition in his own person, Lord John did not dislike to govern the Prime Minister."[2]

"Of the Rockingham faction, there were but two persons who could pretend any expectation of succeeding the Marquis: these were the Duke of Richmond and Charles Fox. The marvellous abilities of the second excluded all competition in that respect. Every other consideration was against him. The King's aversion, his own desperate fortune, disreputation with the public; nor had he been, till of late, at all connected with that faction.[3] The prudery of Lord John's virtue, that had excommunicated Wilkes, had long distasted Fox. The present emergence endeared him to Lord John. Yet Fox was of too superior abilities, and too apt to think and act for himself, to present a tame candidate to one so fond of dictating as Lord John.[4] He entered into the strictest

[1] This is very unlike Lord John.—G. (Grey.)

[2] I knew Lord John, and nothing can be more inconsistent than this appears to me to be with his real character.—G.

[3] All this appears to me to have proceeded from a very false view of the state of things at the time.—G.

[4] Lord John fond of dictating ! ! ! Fox, Lord John's instrument ! ! ! —G.

union with Fox, but had the address to make him his instrument, not his nominee."[1] "The former was not only the first of that faction in rank and abilities, but ought long before to have had the pre-eminence of Lord Rockingham. Impressed with the meanest opinion of Lord Rockingham's talents and firmness, which I frequently ridiculed to the Duke, I had more than once pressed him to assume the command of the party, and had represented the impropriety of such parliamentary abilities, spirit, and activity as his Grace's acting in subordination to an almost mute. Yet such was the Duke's sacred respect to friendship, that he would never hear of any competition with Lord Rockingham."

"When the Marquis was out of the question, confidence in himself, justice, and perhaps my former suggestions, must have whispered to the Duke of Richmond that the vacant place was due to him. I had reason afterwards to believe that he *at least expected that the Cavendishes, his dear friends, would think of no other man;* yet, at that time, he gave not the slightest indication of such a wish. Lord John took care not to inspire him with it, nor did it seem to occur even to Burke, though as he, with all his ungovernable fancy and want of judgment, had a great ascendant over the Duke, as well as over Charles Fox, he might have expected much weight under the Duke's Administration."

"Objections no doubt there were. The King's aversion to the Duke was not less known than to Charles Fox. The Duke, with a thousand virtues, was *exceedingly unpopular;* but these were not what operated on Lord John, at least, not the first. But the Duke of Richmond, though a warm friend, *was far from being always a tractable one.* He was apt to have *speculative* visions, not suited to practice, and was particularly romantic upon the article of parliamentary representation, even beyond the ideas of the associations." "With the Yorkshire Associations Lord Rock-

[1] [These remarks have been retained as parts of Mr. Walpole's narrative, though the character he gives and the views he attributes to Lord John Cavendish had no existence but in his own imagination. From old family jealousies and differences he had a rooted dislike of the Cavendish family, and more particularly of Lord John.]

ingham had been, and Lord John Cavendish was, at the most open enmity." "But when Lord John recurred to his first principles, a Cavendish for first Minister, and a tool ductile to himself, his thoughts did not wander to another great family. In two days, the town heard with astonishment that the Rockingham faction set up for first Minister the Duke of Portland, then Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland; a novel symptom,[1] by which alone he was at all known. Nobody recollected that he had been Lord Chamberlain in Lord Rockingham's first Administration. From that time he had lived in the most stately, but most domestic privacy, often in the country, and latterly in Burlington House, lent to him by the Duke of Devonshire, whose sister he had married, being in too great straits to have a house of his own. His fortune (though 12,000*l.* a year was still detained from him by his mother, the Duchess Dowager) had been noble; but obscure waste, enormous expense in elections, in contesting the counties of Westmoreland and Cumberland with Sir James Lowther, in which the Duke had received bitter treatment from the Crown, and too much compassion for an idle and worthless younger brother, Lord Edward, to support whose extravagance he had deeply dipped his estate, had brought him into great distresses, now increased by the expense of his Vice-royalty, which he did not enjoy long enough to indemnify himself. In other respects his character was unimpeached; but he had never attempted to show any parliamentary abilities, nor had the credit of possessing any. Nor did it redound to the honor of his faction, that in such momentous times they could furnish their country with nothing but a succession of mutes."

"Still, Lord John's arrogant modesty was received as law by his faction, and Lord Shelburne was desired by the voice of the party to acquaint his Majesty that the Whigs recommended the Duke of Portland to his Majesty, to succeed Lord Rockingham. Lord Shelburne accepted the mission, and, returning, reported to the delegates that his Majesty had been pleased to appoint himself *First Lord of the Treasury.*"

[1] Query, station?

"Such an affront to the sovereignty of the Cavendishes was received with proper spirit. The signal of resignation was fired by Charles Fox, who instantly carried the seals to St. James's, declaring that the day before the death of Lord Rockingham he had notified his intention of resigning; unable to endure the treacheries of Shelburne, and his interference in his (Fox's) province. Lord John as immediately announced his own retreat, and no doubt expected to be followed by all his connection; but he was disappointed, as he had been when his brother had been disgraced in 1763. He now made but few martyrs. Few saw the propriety or expedience of the Duke of Portland being Minister. The temperate did see the mischief of disunion in the party, and apprehended that it would lead to a restoration of the old Ministry, and consequently to a revival of the American War. The King no doubt exulted in having defeated a party that had often thwarted his views, and had so lately compelled him to receive them on their own terms."

There can be little doubt that the Duke of Richmond expected, naturally enough, that he should be named by Lord Rockingham's friends as his successor in office, and in party; and there can be, I think, as little, that his chagrin at not being so swayed his subsequent conduct. However, this neglect of him, on their part, whether just or unjust, politic or impolitic, may, even from Walpole's own statement, be accounted for, without ascribing all the selfishness and design to Lord John Cavendish, which his sneers would insinuate against him. Mr. Burke and Mr. Fox (who certainly could not participate in the feelings imputed to Lord John), concurred with him in considering the Duke of Richmond's appointment to the Treasury, or adoption as head of the party, as impracticable or improper; and Walpole, in explaining Lord John's motives, though he means to be satirical, assigns many solid reasons against such a choice; namely, the Duke of Richmond's *extreme unpopularity, his intractability*, and what he terms his *speculative visions*, and romantic and impracticable schemes about parliamentary reform. These were doubtless the induce-

ments for preferring a man so much his inferior in talents and public services as the Duke of Portland. But that there was in appearance something unreasonable in doing so, Mr. Fox, on whom the task of communicating the resolution to the Duke of Richmond devolved, certainly felt. Both General Fitzpatrick and Mr. Fox himself, have more than once acknowledged to me (Lord Holland) in conversation, that Mr. Fox was much embarrassed how to mention it to the Duke of Richmond. The manner in which Mr. Fox at last conveyed such unpleasant intelligence was this: "We must," said he, "settle without delay, whom to propose as the successor of Lord Rockingham; and as *you and I* are both out of the question, owing to the decided part we have taken about parliamentary reform, I think the Duke of Portland should be the man." The Duke of Richmond was too shrewd not to know that Mr. Fox could not wave the lead in the House of Commons, which secured him an equal share of weight with the leader of a party in the House of Lords, but that the nomination of another peer was an exclusion of him, the Duke of Richmond, from the first prize the party had to bestow. This might be a necessary step, but it could not be pleasant to the Duke of Richmond, and it accounts for, and palliates, though it does not justify, his conduct to his nephew and old friends.—V. H.

On Lord Rockingham's death, Pitt expressed his concern to Mr. Fox, under the gallery, at the report that Government would break up. Fox said, "it would; and the whole system be revived;" adding, "they look to *you; without* you they cannot succeed; *with* you I know not whether they will or no." "If," replied Pitt, "they reckon upon *me*, they may find themselves mistaken." Fox, as he left the house, repeated this to Lord John Townshend, and Lord Maitland (afterwards Lauderdale), and probably many others; and both Townshend and Lauderdale told it me. Fox added, "I believe *they do* reckon on Pitt, and I believe they will *not* be mistaken."—V. H.

"In the first moments of the breach, the Duke of Richmond was inclined to resign with the Cavendishes. He could not be willing to remain in a Court to which he was unwelcome, nor to

break with his party, nor to quit them for Shelburne, whose intrusion and *obstruction to Lord Rockingham and his friends*, he had so lately with them resented. Whether *sensibility to their preference of the Duke of Portland offended him* — whether they demanded his co-operation too imperiously, or whether his delight in his new office (the Ordnance) which furnished his activity with employment, and his virtue with prospects of reformation, preponderated, he *soon* disapproved the measure of retreat. Burke and Charles Fox as inconsiderately, and the Cavendishes, though more decently, as steadily, condemned the Duke's separation from them. Fox being his Grace's nephew, the Duke was most offended with him. I was fortunately *one* of those evenings with the Duke when Fox came to expostulate with him. I would have retired, but the Duke pressed me to stay. Fox was very urgent, the Duke very firm. I interposed, and told Fox that though I was persuaded no man in England was so fit to be Minister as himself, yet I could not but disapprove his, and his friends, disuniting the party, nor thought they had sufficient grounds for breaking with Lord Shelburne; I intreated both him and the Duke to argue without passion, and to remember, that being such near relations, they must come together again, and therefore I hoped neither would say what the other could never forgive. I did prevent any warmth, and they parted civilly, though equally discontent with each other."

"The paucity of followers was a sad lesson to the resigners of their ill-digested precipitation. Fox grew sensible of it, and confessed it. Richard Fitzpatrick, his friend, and Secretary of Ireland, who seconded the admonitions of the Cavendishes to the Duke of Portland to quit his viceroyalty, as he did, though entreated by the new Premier, in the King's name, to retain it— Fitzpatrick, I say, though his sister was Shelburne's wife, chose to follow the fortune of his friend rather than of his brother-in-law. Meeting me at the play, on his return from Ireland, he said to me: 'I fear you disapprove us, and indeed I do not know whether we have not been in the wrong.' I replied: 'Mr. Fitzpatrick, I feel too much *concern* to have any room for *blame*.' "

"The point that struck most with the Duke was his cousin and friend Admiral Keppel, whom the zeal of Lord Rockingham and the Cavendishes, on his trial, called on to fulfil his debt of gratitude. To Lord Shelburne he had had no obligations. To the Duke of Richmond the same as to the Cavendishes. The Duke did prevent the Admiral's immediate resignation, but he declared he meditated it, and did intend it so much, that he satisfied the Cavendishes; and they, in their turn, chose to seem satisfied that by maintaining friendship with him they might preserve opportunities of urging him to resign. This dubious conduct of Keppel led the Duke to profess the same kind of neutral ambiguity. Keppel professed to retain the Admiralty but till the peace. The Duke the Ordnance, till he should complete his reforms. It would have been improper in Keppel to resign at that moment; he had sent Admiral Pigot to supersede Lord Rodney, who had just obtained a great victory. News had come of the Quebec fleet being taken. Had Keppel retired then, he would have opened new ways to his enemies of loading him with obloquy, and given them power to oppress him."

"General Conway was not in the same difficult situation. He had uniformly on all occasions declared himself of no party, nor in any opposition but to the American War. He had never engaged in any concert, or councils, with Lord Rockingham; and if he leaned to any faction by ties, it was to the Duke of Grafton, who chose him into Parliament, and who adhered to Lord Shelburne, and to his son-in-law the Duke of Richmond. He looked on the resignation of Fox as a violence of faction, which might impede the peace and restore the old Ministers; and could have no idea why the Duke of Portland should be Minister, or why any man should resign because he was not. Still less did he think that the government of the army ought to be an instrument of faction, and, having long determined to confine himself to his profession, he would not be the tool of intrigues. Fox and Burke resented his neutrality, and the latter, particularly, ridiculed it in a speech in the House of Commons, though it was Conway's motion that gave the first majority to the Opposition. Fox had pro-

nounced a sublime panegyric on the services of Conway, whom he congratulated as having twice saved the country; first, by moving the repeal of the Stamp Act in 1765, and recently, by moving to stop the prosecution of the American War. Conway replied [*i. e.* to Burke] with temper, called the House to witness how often he had disclaimed all factions, and referred to the disinterestedness of his life for the purity of his intentions and conduct."

"But Conway's strongest reason for remaining in office was of far higher nature than any political ties. Negotiations for peace, both with France and America, were in agitation: was the consideration whether Portland or Shelburne should be Prime Minister important enough to cross such urgent objects?"

"In a conversation with Lord J. Cavendish not long afterwards, I told him frankly that I did rejoice that Mr. Conway had retained his post. He had pledged himself to the House of Commons and to the public that America was disposed to make peace with us: was not his honor then at stake to endeavor to realize his engagements?"

Walpole relates at some length a curious, and not very creditable proposal, made to him by Burke, which, though it has no immediate connection with Mr. Fox, I cannot help extracting, or rather abridging from Walpole's narrative. After Lord J. Cavendish had notified his resignation, and within forty-eight hours of the time at which he was to deliver up the seals of the Exchequer, Burke, who was only an acquaintance, not an intimate friend of Walpole, requested him to apply to his brother, Sir Edward (who was a stranger to Burke, and a warm enemy of his politics), to resign his place of Clerk of the Pells, worth 7000*l.* per annum, in consideration of the full yearly value being secured to him by Mr. Burke, and of the disposal of a small place then in the younger Burke's possession. Walpole, after some intercourse and explanation with Burke, and through his son, convinced him that the proposal (which Walpole terms frantic) was quite inadmissible, and, though Walpole did not refuse to convey it to Sir Edward, Burke gave it up. Burke's son "dropped that his father had always intended to get the office of Clerk of the Pells." This

acknowledgment draws from Walpole some severe but just reflections on Burke's having omitted that office in the great sinecures abolished by his bill.[1]

"On this change of Ministry, it came out that Lord Shelburne had obtained a pension of 3100*l.* for life, for Colonel Barré. Lord Shelburne had had the address to persuade Lord Rockingham, and he had had the folly, with Lord J. Cavendish and Frederick Montague, to pass that grant. It was so offensive, that notice was immediately taken of it in the House of Commons, where Barré's defence was still more imprudent than his acceptance of the grant. He pleaded having lost his commission in the army, for having opposed the Court from his conscience; and urged that, had he remained in the service, he might by that time have been a general, and have had a regiment or government equal in value to his pension. The House accepted that broker-like apology. Lord North's and Robinson's pensions had escaped, by the same general timidity."

"Scandalous as Barré's case was, I think Dunning's still worse. He and Barré, the latter indeed more brutally, had declared, on Burke's reforming bill, for taking away all sinecure patent places, even from the present possessors, though, as it appeared in 1783, the lawyers and the whole of the House of Commons, within a very few, declared that no freehold was or ought to be more sacred. Dunning, being a lawyer, had less excuse than Barré for breaking a law which he had himself co-operated in making. Parliament had voted abolishment of the Duchy of Lancaster, yet, besides the peerage, Dunning, by Lord Shelburne's interest, had

[1] [Such is the account of the strange proposal, given by Walpole, in his Journal, and faithfully abridged by Lord Holland; but from an original letter of the younger Burke, which Walpole has left among his papers, it appears that it was the son, and not the father, for whom the place was destined, in case Sir Edward Walpole had been prevailed on to resign it. "Young Burke told me," says Walpole, "his father always intended to get him the place of Clerk of Pells; therefore it was omitted in the new Bill (*i. e.*, Burke's second Reform Bill)." "My father always intended to get this for me; therefore the Clerk of Pells omitted; you won't mention this."]

obtained the Duchy of Lancaster, with a pension of 4000*l.* a year for life. It has been not uncustomary to give pensions to eminent lawyers who accept great offices, to indemnify them for losing the gains of their profession—but why the abolished Duchy? Was it not wanton insolence? Did he not seem, the moment he became a courtier, to have satisfaction in laughing at his own act of patriotism?"

"This effrontery of Shelburne, Barré, and Dunning, and the rapacious profligacy[1] of the two latter, was still more cruelly contrasted at the end of the year. Shelburne, pretending to pursue reformation, struck off a parcel of small offices and pensions, that had been bestowed on old servants and dependents, now grown old, and incapable of getting their bread; yet Dunning's and Barré's pensions perhaps wasted more public money than the salaries of fifty reduced persons would discharge. The whole scene of reformation was a mummery that at once insulted the nation, virtue, and charity, and enriched only the principal reformers."

"The Rockingham party, in a (cabinet) council of nine, had proposed to declare America independent, previously to any treaty. Shelburne objected, and they were divided four and four. Conway turned the question in favor of the negative, by representing that the acknowledgment of independence might be a leading argument for their making peace with us; but should they refuse peace, should we not weaken our right of warring on them by having acknowledged their independence?"

In alluding to these transactions, Lord Shelburne, with some humor, observed to Mr. Fox, that "that *innocent man*, General Conway, never perceived that he had the casting-vote of the Cabinet." Mr. Fox quoted this saying of Lord Shelburne, in proof of the felicity of expression which, in spite of the incorrectness of his language, Lord Shelburne often attained. He

[1] Rather hard words these to be used by a man who himself enjoyed more than one sinecure, and whose relations and friends (Walpoles, Seymours, &c.) had so many thousands of the public money.—V. H.

added another instance of it, which marks, at the same time, the state of the Cabinet in which they sat and disputed together. "It was very provoking, I must own, for you," said Lord Shelburne to Mr. Fox, "to see Lord Camden and the Duke of Grafton come down, with their *lounging opinions*, to outvote you in Cabinet."—V. H.

[At Lord Rockingham's death, there were of the old Whig, Newcastle, or Rockingham party, five members left in the Cabinet, viz.: Mr. Fox, Lord John Cavendish, Lord Keppel, General Conway, and the Duke of Richmond. Of these, Mr. Fox and Lord John Cavendish resigned immediately on the appointment of Lord Shelburne to be the First Commissioner of the Treasury. Lord Keppel considered himself bound to remain in office till the campaign was at an end, and, in fact, he did not resign till January, 1783. Conway, who affected to be no party man, retained his situation as Commander-in-Chief till the dismissal of the Coalition Administration. The Duke of Richmond not only continued in office, but used his utmost endeavors to persuade his friends not to resign. His motives for this conduct will be found in the extracts from Walpole's journals, and in the comments of Lord Holland annexed to them. It cannot be denied that, whatever plausible reason, or first excuse there may have been for the preference given to the Duke of Portland over him, the consequences were most injurious to the Whig party. The defection of a man of such weight and abilities as the Duke of Richmond, induced or encouraged others to follow his example, and his firmness during the memorable contest of 1784 is said to have prevented Mr. Pitt from following the example of his cousin, Lord Temple, by resigning in despair. It was on that occasion George III. was reported to have said, "there was no man in his dominions by whom he had been so much offended, and no man to whom he was so much indebted as the Duke of Richmond."]

Immediately, or almost immediately after the nomination of Lord Shelburne to the Treasury, the following hasty, discursive, and somewhat disingenuous paper was communicated to Mr. Fox:—

"The question in the present crisis seems to me to be, first,

whether Lord S. is hostilely inclined; that is to say, whether he is resolved to co-operate with the scheme of Government you have been so long opposing. If he is, is that system with his assistance, and all such other aids as late circumstances may have added to it, strong enough to stand against the strength now in being, or soon likely to exist, which *can* be brought against it? If it is, I see but two lines; one to endure the servitude, and to take in common with others (since no better can be done) whatever sweets it may afford; the other (supposing the advantages not to compensate the mortifications, disgraces, and uncertainty, &c.) is mere despair—to throw up the game, and give all for lost. If, on the contrary, there is still stuff sufficient, there is hope in the battle. Another question will be, whether now or hereafter, that is to say, on a supposition he *is* an enemy, if the fortress is not inexpugnable, and you are resolved to fight it out. If you fight now, it must be by going out, or rather your going out will be the immediate and inevitable consequence. If, hereafter, you must keep your places *at all events—let what will happen*—things go on as they may (for turn you out they dare not, and certainly will not), till next session. Then my notion is, *that still continuing to be ministers, you should put the whole to issue sturdily and violently in the House of Commons.* Perhaps this is all nonsense. My reasons for thinking it plausible are, that it is always better to fight on strong ground—I mean by that, ground of power, or at least the appearance of power. Secondly, it will preclude the disadvantages of putting people to the trial of giving up their places, by which means many would act with you when it came to the point, who would not at this time declare enmity. So far with regard to those who stand in suspense. Thirdly, with regard to those who will wish to side with the victors, your going out now must give the appearance of being beat, which will be ambiguous while you continue in. Fourthly, if this country is really and to all intents a monarchy, where everything is decided by the factious manœuvres of the closet, you must consider the Parliament as only a sort of auxiliary to give you the preponderance over your colleagues. I do not know whether this is taking the matter in a new light. I

rather suspect it is the true one, and that the affairs of this country must hereafter be regulated upon it."

This paper is without date or signature, but seems to be in the handwriting of Mr. Burke. * It is, however, so low in tone, so obscure in language, and so vague in purpose, as to be very unlike any composition of Mr. Burke.*

The following, which takes a similar view of the question, and must have been written before any definitive resolution was adopted, has the initials E. B. annexed to it.

"The more I think of the matter of our conversation this day, and the more I tumble it over in discourse with others, the more fully I am convinced of the utter impossibility of your acting for any length of time as a clerk in Lord Shelburne's Administration. If that be the case, the only question upon your staying in will be, whether office be not the best post to occupy in the war that *must* be between you. If you go out *now*, I hardly think much can be done until Parliament meets. That must be the seat of war, and whether your being in, and leaving him to turn you out, may not be the best course, may admit of a question. To proceed in this way, however, with a fairness that would, without it, give a bad or doubtful appearance to your conduct, I would not only oppose, but propose, and would state the Duke of Portland, or get a brother Cabinet Councillor to propose yourself. This is always the best course; for the mere negative to a Minister I never knew to answer. It gets no party. If your friends will not act with you, all plans are vain. But if they should, and yet are not willing at present to retire, it would be fair to tell the King that, in this instance, you are not willing to throw his affairs into disorder, that you cannot confide in Shelburne, and that you remit the matter to the sense of Parliament, which, in some way, you are resolved to take as soon as it meets. This is the best trimming way to proceed in, in order to act openly, and yet not to bring on a decision, which your friends are not ready for. But none of these are to be compared to a unanimous and firm decision against the measure, which must oblige them either to renounce it, or to form arrangements for which I do by no means conceive them at

present to be ready. But if you do neither the one nor the other of these things, then you are fairly bullied, and may be obliged to act a truckling and subservient part to those whom you neither love nor respect.

"Yours ever,

"E. B."

[The remaining letters, though few in number, are worth insertion. They corroborate and illustrate Mr. Fitzpatrick's narrative.]

MR. FOX TO LORD OSSORY.

"*July* 3, 1782.

"I have only time to write a line to beg you to come to town to see the *dénouement* of this farce, whether the title of it ought to be *Les Dupes*, or *Honesty the worst Policy*, or what I cannot tell; but the last scene is certainly come.

"Yours affectionately,

"CHARLES JAMES FOX."

MR. FITZPATRICK TO LORD OSSORY.

"*July* 3, 1782.

"DEAR BROTHER:—

"I did not write to you last night because nothing was decided, neither is there anything absolutely so yet. Whatever is right is never done, nor will be, in this instance, I am afraid. From the first moment I saw our *beau frère* I was sure that everything had been settled in the closet, and that he had the appointment of First Lord of the Treasury in his pocket. But if it is suffered, there is certainly a total end of *Whig principles*, and everything more in the hands of *Satan* than ever. Charles is very decidedly of this opinion, and will move heaven and earth to resist the appointment; but the rest of the Cabinet are not equal to take that decisive line of conduct, though, in my opinion, the House of Commons are universally against Shelburne. Charles wishes you

would come to town. My intention was to have been at Ampthill on Friday, and Sunday is the latest I can stay, though I should wish to see this, which I consider as the last stake, decided before I go. If they let *him* have the Treasury in his hands, it must inevitably be over with them, as a party, and with Charles, and with the House of Commons, and with everything that is good. Lord Shelburne has managed the thing skilfully, and made a speech well adapted to the circumstances of the times to-day. Adieu. If you do not come to town to-morrow or next day, I will be with you on Saturday.

"Yours affectionately,

"R. F.

"I am sure Lady O. will disapprove of the sacrifice of everything that is right to Shelburne House. I have told *him* my opinions with great freedom, and he received them with great good-humor, kindness, and condescension from so *great* a man."

MR. FOX TO MR. FITZPATRICK.

"*July* 4, 1782.

"Dear Dick:—

"Last night, I thought everything finally and rightly settled. This morning, I am again afraid. The Duke of R. [Richmond] has been with me, and says he thinks Lord S. willing (as I thought he would be) to give up the point of America. He is now gone to persuade Lord John to be Secretary of State, in which, if he succeeds, I shall have a hard task to refuse, but am still of opinion *that even in that case I shall do it.* One of the many mischiefs of all these negotiations is that, when it breaks, it will prevent such of our friends as differ in opinion with us upon the prudence of the measure from acting heartily with us hereafter. I wish I could see you. I shall be about all morning. I did not think it had been in the power of politics to make me so miserable as this cursed anxiety and suspense does.

"Yours most affectionately."

MR. FITZPATRICK TO LORD OSSORY.

"*July* 5, 1782.

"DEAR BROTHER:—

"I agree with you perfectly, that honesty is the worst policy, and always was of that opinion. It is that, however, which Charles has had the magnanimity to adopt, and that in a manner which all men of real sense and spirit admire, though, perhaps, few will dare to imitate. The opinions of the public stand thus upon the question. All persons who have any understanding, and no office, are of opinion that Charles has done right. All persons who have little understanding, are frightened. And all persons who have offices, with some very few brilliant exceptions, think he has been hasty. I shall stay to-morrow for a meeting of *Whigs*, where the Duke of Richmond means to endeavor to persuade others to keep him in countenance by keeping their places. This will be no difficult matter, perhaps, but to persuade the Whigs *out of office* that the measure is right, will be difficult.

"I have been, this evening, with the greatest and most absolute Minister in the world, who is so happy that he cannot conceal his joy at being *forced* into his present situation. He is, however, very good-humored, and very liberal of his offers, I assure you; titles, honors, offices, emoluments, all are in his hands. This world was made for Cæsar.

"Adieu, dear brother; I will dine with you on Sunday, and shall proceed the next morning.

"'Victrix causa Deo placuit sed victa Catoni.'

"Yours affectionately,

"R. F."

LORD SHELBURNE TO LORD OSSORY.

"SHELBURNE HOUSE, *July* 4, 1782.

"MY DEAR LORD:—

"The loss of Lord Rockingham, among other consequences, has occasioned my being called upon to succeed him. You know

me enough to be certain that it is not an event which suits me or mine. In the situation of public affairs, I do not think myself at liberty to decline it, and hazard the loss of what we are all engaged in. I am desirous of getting my own Board filled not merely with politicians, but friends, and I shall be very happy if you will add to it the character of a relation.

"Mr. Fox resigned this day, on account of this appointment not being from among the late Lord Rockingham's friends. I do not find any person has announced a resolution of the same sort, except Lord J. Cavendish, who was always determined to retire. I beg to be very affectionately remembered to Lady Ossory, and am most truly yours,

"SHELBURNE."

LORD OSSORY'S ANSWER.

"My dear Lord :—

"From the moment of the death of poor Lord Rockingham, I was fearful the consequence would be the dissolution of the new system. I cannot but truly lament that it has happened. I am much obliged to you for so early a mark of your attention to me, but must beg leave to decline your obliging offer. I assure you it is not from any political motives, not having had any concert with anybody, or taken any engagement, since this event. I know how precious your time is; therefore I shall only add, that I am,

"My dear Lord,

"Yours, &c.,

"OSSORY."

I have transcribed these letters, not merely because they relate to persons nearly connected with my family, but also because they give a picture of the state of parties and feelings of individuals; and above all, show the confidence and friendship which Mr. Fox inspired in men of understanding, with whom he was in any way connected or intimate. Lord Ossory was a man of sense, reflection, and prudence, and not much liable to be swayed by party

feelings, or much disposed *brachia tendere contra torrentem.* He had little ambition, though very desirous, from a dislike of the turmoil, and still more of the expense of elections, to obtain an English peerage. He must have known that he might easily have obtained his wishes, and without reproach, from his brother-in-law, if he had joined him; but he (like many others) felt that Mr. Fox was formed to govern the country, and could not bear to separate from him—a proof of the ascendency the great and amiable qualities of Mr. Fox, in spite of his imprudences, had given him over calm, dispassionate, and reasonable minds, as well as over his immediate adherents.

MR. FITZPATRICK TO LORD OSSORY.

"Dublin Castle, *July* 15, 1782.

"Dear Brother:—

"I was not mistaken in my opinion of the Duke of Portland's sentiments upon the present crisis, and found that, from the first moment he had been apprised of what the state of things was in England, he had not entertained one instant's doubt of the propriety of immediate resignation. If you had pursued your intentions of coming over here, your alarms, with respect to Ireland, would have been considerably increased by seeing the effect which the Duke of Portland's resignation is likely to produce. I assure you, without exaggeration, that the difficulties we shall find in quieting the minds of the public, and moderating the violence which seems ready to burst forth against the new system, are hardly to be conceived but by people on the spot. The Duke of Portland's intentions, though not declared, are so strongly suspected, that they are ripe for proceeding all lengths against a Ministry in whom they have no confidence, and against which their prejudices are strengthened by the supposed intention of resigning in the Duke of Portland. The recruiting for the navy, which had begun with the fairest prospect of success, is likely to be much retarded by the prevailing jealousies; there seems even a disinclination to suffer the bill for the offer of 5000 land forces to pass. In short, the appearances are such that I really think

the future prospects in this country are to the last degree alarming. Lord Shelburne's unpopularity in Ireland is really something hardly to be credited, particularly in the north (where he fancies himself a great favorite), upon the score of American independence, and the idea of that being the cause of the rupture does not a little add to the general ferment. Our task under these circumstances is full of difficulty. The measure of resignation implies such want of confidence, that it is but with a bad grace we can recommend it to the public. I had fifty people before the meeting of the House this morning with me, all inquiring what were the wishes of Government at the present moment. My answer was that all our wishes were to conclude the business of the session, quietly and expeditiously, and I hope we shall effect this. But how our successors will conduct the Government I am at a loss to conceive. I believe I may say, and really without *puffing*, that the Duke of Portland's Administration had so completely conciliated the minds of the people at large to them, and had inspired such a degree of confidence in the public, that the change of Government, and especially by proceeding from the exaltation of a man of whom a general distrust and ill opinion prevails, will make this country ten times more difficult to govern than ever.

"The Duke is now employed in writing his letter to Lord Shelburne. He has written to the Duke of Richmond letters, which, if he has any feeling, must, I think, cut him severely. I have no letter from Charles, but accounts say that he never distinguished himself more than on Tuesday. He is here held in a degree of the highest estimation from his step on this occasion, as he must be in England when his conduct is understood. I will write again when I have time. I shall certainly keep my resolution faithfully, of checking all mischief. Indeed, the country is so much more ripe for it than I could have imagined, that no excesses will surprise me.

"Yours affectionately,

"R. F.

"P. S. The state of things will, I fancy, smooth our par-

liamentary business; it is out of doors that the danger is to be apprehended."

*The resignation of Mr. Fox, upon Lord Shelburne's succeeding to Lord Rockingham as First Lord of the Treasury, seems to have been almost inevitable. After the secret negotiation of Mr. Oswald, at Paris, Mr. Fox could not have conducted the negotiations for peace with that reliance on his chief which was necessary in so difficult a matter. Putting resentment out of the question, the responsibility imposed on the Secretary of State required a cordiality of co-operation which Mr. Fox could never have expected from Lord Shelburne.

But, conceding this point, it must be owned that, whether Mr. Burke or Lord J. Cavendish were the adviser, the field of battle was the worst that could be chosen. Lord Shelburne, the friend and colleague of Lord Chatham, a Secretary of State under Lord Rockingham, a man of varied acquirements, and undoubted abilities, was, personally, far superior to the Duke of Portland as a candidate for the office of Prime Minister. The King, therefore, had a great advantage over Mr. Fox in the apparent ground of the quarrel.

Had Mr. Fox declared that he would not serve under any one; or, at all events, not under Lord Shelburne, who had withheld from him knowledge indispensable to his performance of the duties of Secretary of State, he would have stood on firm ground. The choice of a Prime Minister against the choice of the Crown, and that in the person of a man whose rank and fair character were his only recommendations, appeared to the public an unwarrantable pretension, inspired by narrow jealousies and aristocratic prejudices; nor must it be overlooked, that, technically speaking, the conduct of Lord Shelburne in the negotiation, had in one part not been without excuse. Mr. Grenville had, properly speaking, no more right to negotiate with Franklin, than Mr. Oswald had to negotiate with Vergennes.

Accordingly, the Duke of Richmond, General Conway, and Lord Keppel, remained in office. The cause of reform and re-

trenchment sustained a notable damage, and Mr. Fox did not obtain that justice to which he was entitled.

Lord Holland's reflections on Mr. Fox's public conduct in Lord Rockingham's Administration, and his resignation of the Seals in 1782, will form an appropriate termination to the present volume. It will be seen that, while Lord Holland justifies the resignation, he says nothing to justify the preference given to the Duke of Portland over Lord Shelburne, the Duke of Richmond, and, above all, over his uncle's own superior claims to the succession of Lord Rockingham.*

The first endeavors of Mr. Fox, on the accession of Lord Rockingham's Administration, were directed to an overture for peace, and the establishment of a pacific system founded on a balance of power in Europe, and for that purpose was recommended the mission, first of Mr. Oswald, and then of Mr. Grenville, to Paris, to negotiate on the basis of the peace, 1763, and the concession of American independence; and, early in May, it was suggested that the independence of America should be conceded in the first instance, and not made a condition of the treaty. It was obvious that the King, distant and haughty in all his communications with Mr. Fox, was averse to such a policy, whenever suggested by him; and it was not long ere symptoms of a different policy, if not of a secret understanding with the King, appeared in another quarter, namely, Lord Shelburne. Both the plans of detaching Holland from the confederacy, and of employing the secret good offices of Prussia for that purpose, and the still more important scheme of propitiating the United States, through Franklin, by an immediate and frank recognition of their independence, were by some means or other baffled and postponed, and Mr. Fox and his immediate friends very early surmised that it was the unwillingness, the incoherence, or possibly the cabals of his colleagues and of the Court, which threw impediments in his way. Soon afterwards, private and confidential letters in May, confirmed yet more strongly in those of June, came from Mr. Grenville at Paris, which contained more than conjectures—actual proof, of underhand negotiations carried on through Mr. Oswald and Lord Shel-

burne with Franklin, by which the former was encouraged by the prospect of some new concessions, and especially of Canada, to hold aloof from the overtures made to him through Mr. Grenville, and the French Government was taught to expect other and more advantageous terms than had hitherto been offered them, from the state of disunion which they ascertained to subsist in the English Cabinet. Mr. Fox, notwithstanding Lord Rockingham's infirm state of health, had before his death expressed in Cabinet his uneasiness and dissatisfaction at the shape the negotiation was assuming; he had often hinted, in pretty plain terms, at the cause of the impediments in the work of peace. He more than once intimated his inclination to resign, unless some steps were taken to give greater authority to the negotiation he was conducting; and on the Sunday before Lord Rockingham's death he actually tendered his resignation, being outvoted in the Cabinet on the question of acceding unconditionally to American independence. His complaints, regarding a secret negotiation yet pending, and resting upon information yet more confidential and secret, rendered the entire disclosure of his motives, if he did resign, impossible and unjustifiable, and it was not till the death of Lord Rockingham, and the subsequent elevation to the Premiership of Lord Shelburne, that he could allege public ground for the step he took; and even then, the ostensible reason, while the real one was suppressed, appeared too personal to find much favor with the public.

Though he was thus deprived of the satisfaction of bringing to a conclusion a war he had so successfully opposed, and the two countries of England and America were perhaps deprived of all the advantages which might have arisen from a speedy, frank, and possibly separate reconciliation between Great Britain and her former subjects, conducted in the spirit of peace and good-will, under his able auspices, yet his short Administration of three months sufficed to impress all European courts with great confidence in his abilities, and to heal for a season, at least, another breach, which, at the accession of the Whig Ministry, seemed on the eve of rending Ireland from Great Britain. The adjustment,

in Ireland, of 1782, was not less the result of the confidence which the congenial honor and genius of two great men, Mr. Fox and Mr. Grattan, inspired in each other, than of the force of circumstances and the skill of negotiation. Incomplete and defective as it undoubtedly was, it yet rescued the empire from great immediate danger, and was the first step taken in the great work of placing the connection of the two Islands on the broad basis of equality, liberty, and justice. Another event, but one for which the Ministry could claim no merit, had somewhat improved the prospects of the country, and was no doubt of advantage in the negotiations for peace—the victory of Lord Rodney. It was not, however, unmixed with embarrassment. That bold and fortunate, but vainglorious commander, had recently been arraigned by the Whigs in Opposition, and especially by Mr. Fox and Mr. Burke, for his rapine and cruelty at St. Eustatia. On their accession to power, in consonance with the opinion they had expressed of his conduct, his recall was sent out immediately. The news of his splendid victory arrived after the recall was sent. But the Ministers virtuously and honestly determined to persist in their measure. They agreed, however, to reward liberally, and even lavishly, the hero of so great and seasonable a victory. They wished to create him an earl. George III. obstinately resisted it; but whether from a reluctance to make honors too cheap by an unexpected and lavish bestowal of them, or from not liking to wash out any odium the Whigs might have incurred by recalling him, I cannot conjecture.

The resignation of Mr. Fox is unquestionably one of the two passages of his public life most open to animadversion, and most requiring explanation. Everything, therefore, that shows the uneasy state of the Cabinet during Lord Rockingham's Ministry, and the grounds for the suspicion and complaint entertained against the King and Lord Shelburne (the real motives of Mr. Fox's resignation), should be preserved for his biographer.

The step was universally lamented, and very naturally censured by many friends of freedom and peace, who were unacquainted with the personal character of Mr. Fox and his colleagues,

and who saw in it nothing but a fatal division in a body of men to whom they were looking for a restoration of the blessings of peace, and the re-establishment of a virtuous system of government at home. To them it seemed the result of mere personal jealousy and squabbles for superiority, in which the interests of the public were overlooked. Some even of those who were better informed of the secret transactions of the parties, and more attached to Mr. Fox than to Lord Shelburne, or the individuals who sided with him, yet doubted the propriety or expediency of an open rupture on the appointment of Lord Shelburne to the Treasury, though they neither approved of the manner of that appointment, nor of the man who had been selected by the King without any consultation with his colleagues. The Duke of Richmond, who there is good reason to believe was yet more personally estranged from Lord Shelburne than Mr. Fox during Lord Rockingham's life, and who, it appears by Mr. Fox's correspondence, fully partook of the indignation felt at Lord Shelburne's conduct, was, it must be presumed, swayed in his judgment against the resignation by the preference given by Mr. Fox and the party to the Duke of Portland, but Burke himself was averse to immediate resignation. Fitzpatrick, and the most intimate personal friends of Mr. Fox, while they acknowledged it to be almost unavoidable, were in their hearts doubtful, and inclined to procrastinate; and although Lord John Cavendish and the Duke of Portland urged, and warmly applauded it, they were not, as Horace Walpole falsely supposes, the real authors and causes of the measure. It was Mr. Fox's own resolution, adopted after much reflection, and founded on a general conviction that he could not conduct the public affairs under Lord Shelburne's Treasury with safety, honor, or advantage; and from resentment at the duplicity with which his negotiations at Paris had been impeded by Lord Shelburne through Mr. Oswald, of which he thought Mr. Grenville's letters furnished him indubitable evidence. He had never been intimately acquainted with Lord Shelburne. At his first entrance into life, he must have been strongly prepossessed against him, for his father, in his latter years, was loud and constant in his

complaints of what he termed and thought (perhaps unjustly) the treachery and ingratitude of Lord Shelburne. During the whole of the American War, Lord Shelburne, though active and able in his opposition to that war, carefully and ostentatiously professed either attachment to Lord Chatham, or an insulated and separate system of politics, and kept studiously aloof from all connection with the Rockingham party. His habits were altogether different from those of Mr. Fox. There was no previous intimacy, much less friendship, between them. When Lord North was driven from the helm, the King preferring Lord Shelburne, as he had more than once preferred Lord Chatham, to the powerful association of the Whig lords, sent to him, and he, in the first instance, concealed the substance of the royal communication; and when he recommended their admission, and conceded what he called "the great prize" of the Treasury to Lord Rockingham, he took special care to mark that it was his advice, and not the King's favor, which placed them in power. He then introduced Mr. Dunning into the Cabinet without notice or concert. Few weeks or even days elapsed before his colleagues perceived, very sensibly, that the small glimmer of royal countenance, which shone upon the Cabinet, was entirely confined to Lord Shelburne and his personal supporters. This was beginning under unfavorable auspices. The distribution of offices was not such as to allay the apprehensions of those who foreboded divisions in the Council or conflicting wills in the administration of affairs. The Foreign Department was, in the improvident regulations of that day, divided between two Secretaries of State. They presided over their respective offices, one of which embraced the north and the other the south of Europe and the Colonies. The consequences were, that wherever a diplomatic agency was required for negotiation with joint powers, the same man was furnished with instructions, and had to correspond with two different principals; or each of those principals employed respectively a separate servant in an affair which was, or ought to have been, substantially the same. This circumstance seems to have accelerated and imbittered the jealousies, which no doubt would sooner or later have arisen between Lord Shelburne and

Mr. Fox; for, though both Mr. Oswald and Mr. Grenville were sent to Paris on their respective missions—the one to Franklin and the other to Vergennes—by Lord Shelburne and Mr. Fox, with the express sanction of the Cabinet, yet the former (Mr. Oswald), it would appear by Franklin's correspondence, and Mr. Grenville's, was the channel of many private communications from Lord Shelburne to Franklin and from Franklin to Lord Shelburne; and the latter (Mr. Grenville), it is clear from his own correspondence to Mr. Fox, suspected yet more concealment and intrigue, and urged most forcibly the danger and dishonor of that double and separate negotiation. There was great mistrust and jealousy on both sides, much mystery and concealment on that of Lord Shelburne, which Mr. Fox and Mr. Grenville attributed perhaps too hastily to a secret understanding with the King, a suspicion which the appointment of Lord Shelburne to the Treasury, without consultation or advice, strongly confirmed. Whether there did exist any absolute difference in the views of the two branches of the Ministry on the subject of peace, is a problem which possibly the perusal of all the papers may not enable the reader quite satisfactorily to solve. But that Lord Shelburne so far listened that he discussed, entertained, and communicated through Mr. Oswald with Franklin, several projects of the latter without communicating them to his colleagues, and especially that strange one of ceding Canada to the United States, is clear enough. There had indeed occurred, before the change of Ministry, and under Lord North, through the busy interference of David Hartley and others, what Franklin calls *a tampering for a separate peace;* and the notion of separating in substance, if not in form, the interests of America from those of France, seems to have been inherited by the Whig Ministry from their predecessors. It had been, according to Hartley, distantly and covertly suggested by Franklin himself. Franklin, however, represented it, when it suited his purposes, as a base endeavor to seduce the Americans to abandon a generous friend, and to sacrifice their feelings of honor and gratitude to an enemy. In the course of these preliminary steps to negotiation, it appeared that there were five Commissioners from

America in Europe empowered to treat of general peace when the Rockingham Administration was appointed; and Dr. Franklin, having communicated his desire of peace through Lord Cholmondeley to Lord Shelburne as early as the 22d of March, and before the change of Ministry was known, Lord Shelburne naturally enough chose him as the channel of communication to the Commission, of which he (Franklin) was one. Mr. Oswald, besides his public instructions, received and delivered private letters to him from Lord Shelburne, immediately on his arrival at Paris, which represented him as "fully apprised of Lord Shelburne's mind." Much confidential intercourse took place between Oswald and Franklin; and according to the relation of the latter, and the subsequent suspicions of Mr. Grenville and Mr. Fox, some projects of Franklin, concerning the cession of Canada to the United States, had been entertained by Oswald and Lord Shelburne before Mr. Grenville's arrival at Paris, and were not communicated either to him or Mr. Fox till long afterwards. The difference at least of the two negotiations, through Oswald and Grenville, did not escape the penetration of Franklin; it was the subject of jokes in society, and of speculation no doubt in the Ministry. Franklin, though he preferred Oswald for his own purposes, and either did, or professed, to doubt the good faith of Mr. Grenville, infers directly the existence of jealousy between the two departments in London, and accounts for it, by remarking that Mr. Oswald was the choice of Lord Shelburne—Grenville, of Mr. Secretary Fox. It is possible and not improbable, that Grenville suspected more concealment, intrigue, and counteraction than really subsisted; but there was certainly, neither in Lord Shelburne's way of transacting business, which was always confused and indistinct, though occasionally striking and decisive—nor in his professions, which were always overcharged and excessive—nor in symptoms perceptible elsewhere—nor in his previous or general character, which may be judged of from the nicknames of "The Jesuit," and "Malagrida," whether deserved or undeserved, anything to disarm the suspicions which prepossession, situation, and circumstances,

attested by a friend naturally raised in Mr. Fox's mind, and which Lord Shelburne's acceptance of the Treasury tended strongly to confirm. This, then, was the true ground of Mr. Fox's resignation. His future biographer and his readers must pronounce if it was sufficient to justify the step, after duly weighing the evidence. How far the King was himself cognizant of Lord Shelburne's share in these transactions, it is perhaps more difficult to ascertain. The points on which Mr. Oswald, with Lord Shelburne's approbation, outstepped the wishes of the rest of the Cabinet, namely, in acknowledging the absolute necessity of peace, the forlorn and disunited state of England, the wish to court America, and the cession of more territory to her, rather than to France, are precisely those to which George III. must have had, one should presume, the greatest repugnance. Yet his original message to Lord Shelburne, rather than to Lord Rockingham, his uniform bias on every trifling occasion, where shades of difference could be discerned, to the former, and his final appointment of him to the Treasury, confirms the persuasion then generally felt in Paris and in London, and strongly entertained by Mr. Fox and his immediate friends, that the Crown and Lord Shelburne were acting in concert to disunite and baffle the Cabinet in all their designs at home and abroad. Lord Shelburne always complained that the King had tricked and deserted him in 1782 and 1783; and to the best of my belief, George III. never formally retracted, or even accidentally contradicted, the character, which in his familiar correspondence with Lord North he had given to Lord Shelburne, by the nickname of "The Jesuit," at any period, or on any occasion subsequent to 1783. They may, and probably did, act in concert together for a purpose, and for a time; but they seemed not to have inspired any mutual confidence, much less any friendship or affection, in one another. It appears, however, from Fitzpatrick's Journal, and other records and reports, that Lord Shelburne was satisfied at the time that he had acquired the King's confidence, and that he (the King) was entirely in his hands. Lord Shelburne was elated thereat. He must have boasted of it to the Duke of Richmond, for he used subsequently to repeat a

remark of the Duke to him, with which he was much pleased, viz.: "Ay; but, my Lord, you must recollect that to be a Sully you must have a Henry IV.," which implies that Lord Shelburne had expressed a confidence in his own power at Court being equal to Sully's. In all probability, the King's chief object was to produce the rupture which ensued, and he did it by encouraging Lord Shelburne to thwart Mr. Fox. It is painful to me to record any misconduct of Lord Shelburne, or to revive any reflection on his character for duplicity. Justice to the memory of Mr. Fox requires me to preserve the facts on which his persuasion of it was grounded, as well as the testimony of their contemporaries, which prove that such a view of his impracticable and insincere character and dealings was not confined to Mr. Fox and his friends.

END OF VOL. I.

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES
0315020673

01342681
92F.832
F V1

MAY 2